



INDIAN CULTURE

Vol. VII. OCTOBER—DECEMBER, 1940. No. 2.

CONTENTS

ARTICLES

Page

INDO-PARTHIAN DYNASTY OF VONONES.

By DR. D. R. BHANDARKAR, M.A., Ph.D., F.R.A.S.B. .. 133

SOME INDIA OFFICE LETTERS OF THE REIGN OF TIPU
SULTAN.

By DR. H. C. RAY, M.A., Ph.D., D.Lit., (Lond.), .. 143

ANCIENT INDIAN GEOGRAPHY.

By DR. S. C. SARKAR, M.A., D.Phil. (Oxon), Dip. Ed. (Oxon). .. 173

KATHAVATTHU—DR. B. C. LAW'S TRANSLATION.

By MRS. C. A. F. RHYS DAVIDS, M.A., D.Litt. .. 191

ON THE EMPEROR MAHIPĀLA OF THE PRATIHĀRA
DYNASTY.

By PROF. H. C. RAYCHAUDHURI, M.A., Ph.D. .. 199

ADMINISTRATION UNDER THE PĀLAS & THE SENAS.

By DR. BENOY CHANDRA SEN, M.A., Ph.D. .. 203

SOME ANCIENT INDIAN TRIBES.

By DR. BIMALA CHURN LAW, M.A., B.L., Ph.D., F.R.A.S.B. .. 221

NANA, THE MOTHER GODDESS IN INDIA AND WESTERN
ASIA.

By MR. BAIJNATH PURI, M.A., (Lucknow). .. 225

GERMANIC AND SANSKRIT.

By DR. BATAKRISHNA GHOSH, D.Phil. (Munich), D.Lit. (Paris). .. 229

MISCELLANEA.

TAXILĀ CASKET INSCRIPTION OF KANIṢKA RECONSIDERED.

By MR. BAIJNATH PURI, M.A. .. 253

KĀKAVARṆA, KING OF MAGADHA.

By DR. DINES CHANDRA SIRCAR, M.A., Ph.D. .. 255

REVIEWS.

THE MAHĀBHĀRATA, UDYOGAPARVAN (2).

By DR. BATAKRISHNA GHOSH, D.PHIL., D.LIT. 259

DVĪPAMAYA-BHĀRATA (Bengali).

By DR. BATAKRISHNA GHOSH, D.PHIL., D.LIT. 259

STUDIES IN THE PURĀNIC RECORDS ON HINDU RITES AND
CUSTOMS.

By DR. BATAKRISHNA GHOSH, D.PHIL., D.LIT. 260

A HITTITE GLOSSARY.

By DR. BATAKRISHNA GHOSH, D.PHIL., D.LIT. 261

BIBLIOGRAPHIE BOUDDHIQUE VII—VIII.

By DR. BATAKRISHNA GHOSH, D.PHIL., D.LIT. 261

DOCTRINE OF ŚAKTI IN INDIAN LITERATURE.

By DR. BATAKRISHNA GHOSH, D.PHIL., D.LIT. 262

KAPPHINĀBHYUDAYA, A MAHĀKĀVYA OF ŚIVASVĀMIN.

By PROF. JAGADISH CHANDRA MITRA, M.A. 262

IMPORTANT CONTRIBUTIONS TO ORIENTAL JOURNALS. 265-268

JUST OUT !

JUST OUT !

THE INDIAN RESEARCH INSTITUTE

Tutorial Series no. I.

Principles of Politics

By

R. C. ADHIKARY.

Indispensable for Students of Politics and persons interested in
the subject of Political Science.

(Pages 660+xxiv)

Price Rs. 8/-

To be had at the INDIAN RESEARCH INSTITUTE

170, Maniktala Street, Calcutta.

INDO-PARTHIAN DYNASTY OF VONONES

By D. R. BHANDARKAR

Years ago I fixed the order of succession among the members of the Vonones dynasty. My paper on this subject was published in *J.B.B.R.A.S.*, Vol. XX. pp. 284 and ff. Almost the whole of my view excepting the position of Maues was adopted by V. A. Smith in his paper *Z.D.M.G.*, 1906, pp. 47 and ff., though he somehow forgot to mention my name. I have now been asked by some scholars to revise my view in the light of the new coins and inscriptions that have been discovered.

Various coins bearing bilingual legends of kings such as Vonones, Spalirises, Azes etc., whose Parthian nationality is unquestionable, have been found, but the order of their succession was not satisfactorily determined till I did so more than forty years ago. Not a single coin of Vonones has yet been discovered where both the Greek and Kharōṣṭhī legends give his name. But the coins, the Greek legends of which mention the name of Vonones, and the Kharōṣṭhī, those of other personages, are not few. Now it is reasonable to infer that the ruler whose name occurs in the Greek legend on the obverse is the paramount sovereign, and the personage whose name is mentioned in the Kharōṣṭhī legend on the reverse is his subordinate; and that further if the titles in the Kharōṣṭhī legends are an exact translation of those occurring in the Greek, the latter may be taken as the Yuvarāja or heir-apparent, but if they are indicative of a subordinate rank, the ruler has to be taken as a viceroy appointed by that sovereign. The titles affixed to the name of Vonones are *Basileus Basileon Megas* which unmistakably point to his supreme power. The personages whose names are mentioned on the reverse are —(1) Spalahores, who is said to be *Mahārāja-bhrātā*,¹ and (2) Spalgadames, son of Spala-

1. Spalahores on his coins calls himself *Mahārājabhrātā*. Who this mahārāja was Percy Gardner is unable to determine. But I think that, almost certainly, Spalahore was a brother of Vonones, as the latter clearly appears to be his overlord, and therefore the king whose brother Spalahores was, can be no other than Vonones. Similarly, one class of Spalirises' coins bears on the Greek obverse the legend *Basileus Adelphos Spalirises*, and on the Kharōṣṭhī reverse *Mahārāja-bhrāta Dhramiasa*. This, in my opinion is indicative of his inferior position at the time when they were struck. And as we have seen, that

hores. Spalahores and Spalgadames were therefore subordinate to Vonones.² It is also plain that during the life time of Vonones, Spalahores died and Spalgadames succeeded him to the Viceroyalty, since, in addition to the coins which bear the father's name, there are others, the reverses of which give the son's name with that of the same overlord Vonones on the obverse of their coins. Next come the coins of Spalirises which present two varieties: (1) coins bearing his name alone in both the legends, and (2) coins on which his name occurs on the obverse in the Kharōṣṭhī. The names on the reverse are: (1) Spalgadames and (2) Azes.³ The first was obviously a viceroy of Spalirises, as he does not assume supreme titles. It has just been stated that Spalahores died when his overlord Vonones was alive, and that after him the viceroyship was held by his son Spalgadames. And, as a matter of fact, no coins, on which the name of Spalahores is associated with that of Spalirises, have been obtained. Vonones, therefore, having the father and the son for the viceroys, must be the earlier prince, while Spalirises, who had the son only for his viceroy, must be the later. Spalirises was therefore the successor of Vonones. The case however is somewhat different in regard to Azes who, although his name occurs in the Kharōṣṭhī reverse, assumes practically the same titles that are coupled with the name of Spalirises on the Greek obverse. We have therefore to conclude that Azes had been appointed Yuvarāja in the time of Spalirises. Similarly, the coins of Azes may be distinguished further into the two classes: (1) those which contain his name in both the legends with titles indicative of supreme power; and (2) those which bear his name in the Greek

before Spalirises became a sovereign Vonones was the paramount ruler, it can scarcely be seriously doubted that he too like Spalahores was a viceroy appointed by and a brother of Vonones. Vonones was thus the supreme ruler, and appointed his brothers Spalirises and Spalahores viceroys to govern the provinces conquered by him, and after the death of the latter, conferred the viceroyalty on his nephew, *i.e.* Spalahores' son, Spalgadames. This seems to my mind the relationship in which they stood to one another. But how Azilises, Vonones, Spalirises and Spalahores were the sons of Azes as Gardner maintains is quite inexplicable to me.

2. *N. Chr.*, 1890, pp. 136-38; Gard., pp. 98-99. A coin described by Edward Thomas and Cunningham as a joint type of Vonones and Azes is really coin of Maues. The supposed connection between Vonones and Azes thus disappears (*Z.D.M.G.*, 1906, p. 61, n. 2; Whitehead, Vol. I. pp. 92-93.)

3. *N. Chr.*, 1890, pp. 138-39; in the notice of coin No. 7 on p. 138, the heading given is 'Spalahores and Spalgadames', but instead of Spalahores, Spalirises is wanted; Gard., pp. 100 and 102.

legend on the obverse and mention the name of Azilises in the Kharōṣṭhī on the reverse.⁴ The first class was issued obviously when he succeeded Spalirises on the throne and was a paramount sovereign, and the second class was struck when Azilises was appointed Yuvarāja as the latter bears practically the same titles in the Kharōṣṭhī that are associated with the name of Azes. There is also a third class of coins issued by Azes, where his name occurs in the Greek legend on the obverse and that of Aśpavarman in the Kharōṣṭhī on the reverse. This point however we will consider shortly and at the proper place. The coins of Azilises are likewise of three distinct classes : (1) coins whereon his name is restricted to the Kharōṣṭhī reverse and that of Azes mentioned in the Greek obverse as just mentioned ; (2) those in both the legends on which his name is given, and is coupled with the epithets of a paramount sovereign ; and (3) two coins at least on which his name occurs on the obverse in the Greek legend, and that of Azes on the reverse in the Kharōṣṭhī.⁵ The first class shows that they were issued when Azilises was the Yuvarāja during the life time of Azes, while the remaining two classes point to his supreme power. Azilises was therefore the successor of Azes and became a sovereign after his death. It has just been stated that on two coins at least the names of Azilises and Azes are found on the Greek obverse and the Kharōṣṭhī reverse respectively. This indicates that Azes was subordinate to Azilises. But this Azes must not be identified with the Azes just mentioned. We must suppose that there were two princes of that name, one the predecessor and the other successor of Azilises, and that it is not unlikely that some of the coins hitherto presumed to be issued by Azes I. were really struck by Azes II. In fact, this view of mine about the existence of the two Azeses was adopted by V. A. Smith in *Z.D.M.G.*, 1906, pp. 62 and ff., and yet, curiously enough, R. B. Whitehead has in his *Catalogue* given credit to Smith for this view.

4. *N. Chr.*, 1890, pp. 140-52 & 170; Gard., pp. 73-92 & 173.

5. *N. Chr.*, 1890, pp. 153-55 & 119; Gard. pp. 93-97 & 92.

6. "The first attempt to draw the line between the coinage of Azes I. and that of Azes II. is that made in my catalogue of coins in the Indian Museum, Calcutta"—so says V. A. Smith in *Z. D. M. G.*, 1906, p. 64; and yet he refers to my paper twice in the footnotes 2 on p. 53 and 2 on p. 59 and admits that it was read before *J. R. A. S. Bom. Br.*, on 19 Oct. 1899. The No. of the *J. B. B. R. A. S.*, Vol. XX. was published in 1902, whereas Smith's paper was printed in 1906 and his *Catalogue* in precisely the same year. And yet he forgot the contents of pages 285-86 of my paper where I have clearly and incontestably proved that there were two Azeses,

Whitehead however criticises this view and says that "if Azilises preceded Azes, then, following Mr. Vincent Smith, we must have Azilises I. and Azilises II. instead of Azes I. and Azes II."⁷ That this view of Whitehead is erroneous has now been incontestably proved by the excavations carried out by Sir John Marshall at Taxila. "The existence of Azes II. which was first postulated by Mr. Vincent Smith," says Sir John,⁸ "has not hitherto been accepted by other numismatists and historians, but Mr. Smith's view now finds corroboration in the fact that the coins of Azes II. were discovered generally, in a higher stratum than those of Azes I., and in the fact also that Aspavarman appears as *Strategos*, or Satrap of Gondophernes as well as of Azes, who manifestly cannot be identified with the first Azes," It is curious that Sir John Marshall also gives credit to Smith for recognizing the two Azeses, though that view was propounded by me first and ten years before Smith published his paper in *Z.D.M.G.*, where he no doubt adopted my view, forgetting, however, to mention my name. Now the testimony adduced by Sir John Marshall on the strength of his excavations at Taxila in support of the view that there were two Azeses is incontrovertible and has now to be accepted by all numismatists and historians. There is also a second point in the above remarks of Sir John, which is of paramount interest in this connection. He informs us that there was a strategos whose name is mentioned on the reverse of the coins not only of Azes II. but also of Gondophares. This clearly shows that Gondophares succeeded Azes II. to the Indo-Parthian throne. What then happens to Maues as he appears on coins, or Moga as he appears in a copper-plate inscription? Did he precede Vonones as maintained by Gardner and Cunningham, or immediately succeed Azes II. as I contended? The line of argument which I then urged against the first view still appears to be irresistible to me. I therefore repeat here what I stated forty years ago. Such numismatists as Wilson, Von Sallet, Percy Gardner and Cunningham⁹ have maintained that since there are two types of Maues's coins which are identical with those of Demetrius and Apollodotus, he was not much posterior to these Greek princes and must therefore be regarded as the earliest prince of this dynasty. Accordingly he has been placed about 70 B.C. by Gardner and about 100 B.C. by Cunningham. The ques-

7. Whitehead Vol. I. p. 93.

8. *A. S. I., An. Rep.*, 1912-13, p. 43.

9. *Ar. Ant.*, p. 313; Gard., Intro. p. XL; *N. Chr.*, 1890, p. 110; *Ibid.*, 1888, p. 242.

tion that we have now to consider is: "Is identity of type a sure mark of contemporaneity?" I believe that when the type of any two kings' coins is alike or even identical, it does not necessarily follow that they were contemporary or even nearly contemporary to each other. It is not unlikely that the coinage of one of those kings was in circulation in the time of the other to whom it might have suggested types for his coinage. And this, in fact, appears to be the case from the coins of Maues himself. For one type of his coins is a close imitation of coins of Apollodotus, and another an exact copy of a coin of Demetrius. And if we availed ourselves for the moment of the dates assigned by Gardner to the Greek and the Indo-Scythian Princes, there would be an interval of ninety years between Demetrius and Apollodotus and of thirty years between Apollodotus and Maues. Demetrius is thus anterior to Maues by one hundred and twenty years. This chronological difference between the Greek and the Indo-Scythian king, is, in my opinion, much less than it most probably is.¹⁰ However, even if we accept it, it can scarcely be reasonably maintained that Maues was contemporary or even nearly contemporay with Demetrius. Identity of type is therefore not a sure proof of contemporaneity, and, in particular, in the case of Maues we have just seen that he cannot possibly be contemporaneous with Demetrius and Apollodotus at the same time, seeing that they were removed from each other by ninety years, and from Maues by one hundred and twenty, and thirty years at least respectively. The assertion that Maues was the first Śaka ruler, entirely based on the argument of the identity of type, thus falls to the ground.

Again, the fact that Maues's coins are confined to the Punjab¹¹ militates against the supposition that he came earlier than any member of Vonones's family. For in that case one would expect to find his coins in countries to the West and North-West of the Punjab, and not in the Punjāb only, as seems to be the case with the coins of Maues. Some numismatists have tried to get over this difficulty by supposing that Maues and his hoard came into the Punjāb by the Karakoram Pass¹². We may however draw the attention of numismatists and

10. Gard., *Intro.* p. xxxiii.

11. Prof. Gardner allots an average of ten years only to every one of the Greek and Scythian kings. In times of peace every reign is assigned a period of twenty-five years. An average of eighteen years seems to be a reasonable one even for a troublous period, but I have assigned fifteen years to each reign, to err on the safe side. *N. Chr.*, 1890, p. 106.

12. Gard., *Intro.* p. XL.

scholars to the refutation of such a view by Cunningham, who says : "I feel quite certain that they could not have come through Kashmir by the Karakoram Pass as suggested by Prof. Gardner, as that pass instead of being open all the year round, is closed during winter and could *never* be traversed by an army even in summer"¹³ The plain conclusion, therefore, from the fact that Maues's coins are confined to the Panjāb, that he came after Azes II., must be accepted. What Īśvaradatta was to the Kṣatrapa family of Caṣṭana,¹⁴ Maues was to the Indo-Parthian family of Vonones, namely, an intruder. Like Īśvaradatta again he was an intruder for the time being only. Because, as stated above, there are coins of Stratēgos Āspavarman, which mention once Azes II. and once Gondophares on the obverse in the Greek legend, as Sir John Marshall has assured us. This clearly shows that before long the power of Maues was upset by Gondophares and Āspavarman.

Long ago Bühler¹⁵ propounded the view that it was morally certain and that unless the contrary was proved we might safely hold that the Mathura date 72 of Śōḍāsa, the Taxila date 78 of Patika, the Takht-i-Bahi date 103 of the Indo-Parthian prince Gondophares, the Panjtar date 122 of a Gushana prince (whose name is lost), etc. were years of one and the same era. To these we may now add the Taxila date of a *Mahārāja Rājātirāja Dēvaputra Kuṣanasa* whose name however is not specified.¹⁶ What era can these dates be referred to? That is the question we have now to consider. Mr. Baij Nath Puri and myself had recently occasion to consider this matter very carefully. He drew my attention to the last of the inscriptions referred to above, wherein occur the words *ayasa asaḍasa*. I had occasion to treat of this inscription in *I.A.*, 1916, pp. 120 ff. Therein I have propounded the view that *ayasa asaḍasa* was equivalent to *ādyasya Āṣāḍhasya*, 'of the first Āṣāḍha.' I was, however, unwise to refer the date 136 of this record to the Vikrama era as others had done, and take 79 A.D. as its English equivalent. I say I was unwise, because neither in the year 79 nor in the year 78 or 80 A.D. there was any intercalary Āṣāḍha month. Nevertheless, I was much gratified to see that no less a Sanskrit scholar and epigraphist than Prof. Sten Konow accepted my interpretation of *ayasa asaḍasa*=*ādyasya Āṣāḍhasya* in *E.I.*,

13. *N. Chr.*, 1890, p. 104.

14. Rapon's *Catalogue of Indian Coins (Andhras, Kshatrapas & c.)*, Intro. pp. cxxxiii & ff.; *Bomb. Gazet.*, Vol. I. Pt. I. p. 52.

15. *Vienna Ori. Jour.*, Vol. X. p. 173.

16. *J. R. A. S.*, 1914, pp. 976-77; 1915, pp. 193 & ff.; *A. S. I., An. Rep.*, 1912-13, p. 19.

Vol. XIV. p. 286. He did not, however, venture to refer the date to any era in that paper of his. But when the same inscription was published in *C.I.I.*, Vol. II. Pt. I. p. 73, I was more gratified to find that here with the help of Dr. von Wijk he was able to fix upon 52 A.D. as the English equivalent of the date 136 of that inscription. And no doubt in the year 52 A.D. came off the intercalary month of Āṣāḍha even according to Swamikannu Pillai. But Pillai's Table X clearly shows that there was an intercalary Āṣāḍha not only in 52 A.D. but also in 44, 63 and 71 A.D. The initial year of this new era was therefore not finally settled, and the matter remained still hanging. The only legitimate course of action was to wait for another similar synchronism. This synchronism was luckily furnished by the Kalawān copper plate inscription of the year 134 which was published in *J.R.A.S.*, 1932, pp. 949 ff., and which contains the expression, *ajasa Śravanasa*, which doubtless corresponds to *ajasa Asaḍasa* of the Taxila record. It was Mr. Puri who drew my attention to this synchronism. I was however astounded by the cataclystic change of view adopted by Prof. Sten Konow who not only gave up his equation of *Ayasa* with *Ādyasya* but returned to Sir John's explanation that *Aya* was the Indian form of Azes, inspite of philological difficulties to the contrary, and referred the date like him to the Vikrama era, thus making it as equivalent to 77 A.D. What was however most singular in his paper was the following passage: "If *Aya Asaḍa* means 'the first Āṣāḍha,' *Ajasa Śravana* 'must mean the first Śrāvaṇa,' and we should have to assume an intercalated Śrāvaṇa in the year 134 and an intercalated Āṣāḍha two years later in 136. Now von Wajk has been good enough to inform me that this is impossible unless one of the years was reckoned as current, the other as elapsed. And I do not think that anybody would be prepared to maintain that such was the case." The last of these remarks is most inexplicable, namely, "And I do not think that anybody would be prepared to maintain that such was the case." As a matter of fact, however, we do know that scholars and epigraphists of unquestionable merit such as R. G. Bhandarkar and F. Kielhorn have maintained such a position. Thus R. G. Bhandarkar remarks: "From inscriptions and books we see that the Hindus' usual, not invariable, way of expressing a date is not in the year so and so, but after so many years had elapsed since such and such event took place. And in the second note given in the 'Early History of the Deccan,' I have shown that in the inscriptions there examined about two-thirds of the dates represented the year expired and one-third the year current. It should by no means be supposed that the expired year is to be understood only when a word expressive of 'having elapsed' is used. We use expired Śaka years at the present day in ordinary transactions, but

never use a word expressive of having elapsed."¹⁷ Kielhorn says practically the same thing when he treats of the Vikrama era, and says that although as a rule the Vikrama years were quoted as expired years, they were also sometimes cited as current years.¹⁸ I therefore fail to understand why one of the two years referred to above may not be taken as a current and the other as an elapsed year. We can calculate accordingly with the help of Swamikannu Pillai's Table and come to the conclusion that 66 B.C. be taken as the initial year of the era, that the date 134 of the Kalawān plate may be taken as a current year giving 68 A.D. as its English equivalent during which year there was an intercalary Śrāvaṇa, and finally that the date 136 of the Taxila scroll should be taken as an expired year which accordingly becomes equivalent to 70 A.D. expired or 71 A.D. current, 71 A.D. doubtless giving the intercalated month of Āśāḍha according to Pillai's Table X. The two synchronisms thus work concurrently to the conclusion that the era according to which the dates of the inscriptions seem to be quoted as mentioned above commences with 66 B.C.

To me, however, it is not clear why on the one hand some of the dates noted above should be taken as Vikrama years or why on the other hand they should be understood as referring to the old Śaka era.¹⁹ This is confusion worst confounded. Mr. Puri, however, will,

17. *J. B. B. R. A. S.*, Vol. XVII. Pt. II. p. 84. 18. *I. A.*, Vol. XX. p. 398.

19. The Vikrama years were originally known as Kṛta years (*R. G. Bhandarkar Comm. Vol.*, pp. 187 & ff.) There was a time when I took the word in the sense of 'made', that is, invented by the astronomers (*I. A.*, Vol. XLII. p. 163), but afterwards I held the view that they were years of the Kṛta yuga (*Ibid.*, Vol. LXI. pp. 101 & ff.). The question of the origin of this era has been discussed by Prof. A. S. Altekar in *E.I.*, Vol. XXIII. pp. 48 & ff., where he has attributed it to a king named Kṛta. I have already shown that this is well-nigh impossible (*I. A.*, Vol. XLII. p. 163). As regards the Śaka era, the epigraphic evidence seems to be in favour of its having been founded in Mālwa by the overlord of Nahapāna and Caṣṭana and continued by his family. And there seems to be no sense in distinguishing the Śaka era of 78 A.D. from any 'old Śaka era of 84 B.C.' as some scholars have done. Prof. Lüders has convincingly shown that the old Parthian era commencing with 247 B.C. was not unknown to India (*D. R. Bhandarkar Vol.*, pp. 287-88). It is therefore not at all unintelligible that there should be another Parthian era, started by the Indo-Parthian family of Vonones. For the same reason we may safely assume that one Kuṣāṇa era—probably the Śaka era—was started by Wema-Kadphises, another by Kaniṣka about 128 A.D. which died a natural death, and a third by the Kuṣāṇaputras circa 248 A.D. which later came to be known as the Kalacuri era. This subject will however be discussed *in extenso* by Mr. Puri before long, with strong evidence in support of it.

I hope, go into this matter fully and systematically. What I would at the present stage remark is that this era is neither Vikrama nor Śaka but rather Indo-Parthian, as to me it appears to have been started by Vonones. The celebrated Nāsik cave inscription of Gautamīputra Sātakarni speaks of three foreign tribes, namely, Śaka, Yavana and Pahlava as having infested North India in and before his time. He is represented to have conquered them. Now, of these, Yavanas are apparently the Greeks, principally the Indo-Bactrian Greeks. Śakas surely are the members of the families of Nahapāna and Caṣṭana. But who were the Pahlavas? They seem to have been almost completely ignored by the historians. Personally I have no doubt that they are represented by the two celebrated Indo-Parthian families of Vonones and Gondophares. It is however worthy of note that in that period when there was the weltering of races and tribes, it was not unfrequently that the Yavana, Pahlava or Śaka king employed a member of one of the two other foreign tribes as his Governor or Viceroy. To quote one instance, the Girnar inscription of Rudradāman speaks of this Śaka sovereign having appointed the Pahlava Suviśākha, son of Kulaipa, as the viceroy of Ānarta and Surāṣṭra.

It has been observed above that it is natural to suppose the date 78 of the Taxila plate as a year of the era, not started by Moga or Maues, but used in his time, that this era is in all likelihood the Indo-Parthian era, and that if we could fix upon the first prince of the Imperial dynasty to which the predecessors of Maues belonged, we should be able to find out the originator of the Indo-Parthian era. With this end in view we have determined the following order of succession of these Indo-Parthian rulers, namely, (1) Vonones, (2) Spalirises (3) Azes I., (4) Azilises and (5) Azes II. The last was followed by Maues a Śaka who was an intruder. Vonones thus appears to be the first prince of the Indo-Parthian dynasty, and hence the founder of the Indo-Parthian era. And, further if we assign an average duration of 15 years to the reign of each one of these rulers, our calculation gives the year 76 as the initial year of the reign of Maues, and the year 90 as perhaps the last year of his reign. This result fits excellently, for, in the first place, the initial year of his reign, according to our reckoning, is earlier than and hence not inconsistent with the date 78 of the Taxila plate of Patika and, secondly, his reign closes before the date 103, of the Takht-i-Bahi inscription when Gondophares was alive and ruling over the Punjab. For about thirteen years the dominions of Gondophares and Maues were conterminous with one another, and shortly before or after the year 90 Gondophares wrested the Punjab from Maues and the Śakas who had supplanted the Indo-Parthian dynasty ruling over that province. If this line of reasoning has any

weight, the Indo-Parthian era originates with Vonones. The coins of Vonones have not yet been obtained, but those of his Viceroys have been found in Arachosia, Seistan, the lower Kabul valley, and the western Punjab. To my mind it appears that the seat of Vonones's Government lay to the West and North-west of Seistan, or perhaps Parthia, and that he subjugated Seistan, Arachosia and other districts in the neighbourhood and appointed Viceroys to govern them. It was when Maues and the Śakas rose to power in the Punjab at the expense of the Indo-Parthians that Gondophares had made himself master of the provinces to the west of the Punjab, where he ruled for a pretty long time. And it was in the year 102 or perhaps a little earlier that he pounced upon the Śaka ruler of the Punjab, whosoever he was, and brought that province under the Indo-Parthian supremacy. Gondophares thus seems to have been an Indo-Parthian but belonged to a different collateral branch as is indicated by the different type of coinage issued by him and continued the supremacy of that race with Asparman as his strategos.

SOME INDIA OFFICE LETTERS OF THE REIGN OF

TIPU SULTAN*

By H. C. RAY

INTRODUCTION

It is admitted by all scholars that the history of the region between the Tungabhadra and the Kaveri during the period roughly extending from 1734, the date of the dethronement of the Mysore prince Cham Raja, to 1799, which saw the death of Tipu Sultan, requires re-examination. In Mysore this was the period of Hindu and Muslim kingmakers who gradually usurped not only all royal powers but in the end also assumed royal titles. In the wider history of India this was largely the period of the phantom Tumurid empire (c. 1761-1803). It was one of those periods of transition which have, in Indian History, always intervened between the fall of one and the rise of another Imperial power.¹ This inevitable period of disruption was dominated by various aspirants for the crown of Indian Imperialism. In this period of struggle not only did the region delimited above geographically play an important role but it produced in Hyder Ali and Tipu two persons of such outstanding ability and energy that they within a short time raised the state of Mysore to a pitch of dignity and power which by general consent was once occupied by Vijayanagar in the history of South India. Politically Mysore again dominated the whole region to the south of the Kṛṣṇā. Like Vijayanagar too it could only be destroyed by a confederacy of all its enemies and that too after a severe struggle. As the complete destruction of Vijayanagar, which weakened political power in the south, helped indirectly the establishment of the Imperialism of the House of Babur and ultimately destroyed the confederates, so also the lack of political vision shown by the Nizam and the Maharattas who combined with the British to bring about the downfall of a hated rival, materially assisted the establishment of a foreign Imperialism which finally destroyed their sovereignty.

Hyder and Tipu both lived in stormy times. The records of none of the contending powers, when judged by modern conditions,

**Miscellaneous Letters*, Mss. Eur. F. 18/1. The "introduction" and "translation" of this paper were read before the "Modern History" Section of the 4th Session of the Indian History Congress held at Lahore in December, 1940.

1. *Dynastic History of Northern India* Ray, Calcutta University, Vol. I, P. XXXVIII.

can be said to be unsullied by any acts of treachery, deceit or dishonour. It would therefore be silly to think that either Hyder or Tipu when judged by modern standard of morals, could be regarded as entirely blameless in their tempestuous political career.² But with the passage of time it has been increasingly realised that the works of Lieut. Mackenzie³ or that of Colonel Wilks⁴ require revision in the light of new materials. They lived perhaps too close to those troublous times to have been entirely free from the heated rivalries and jealousies out of which an empire was taking gradual shape. It would be too much to expect them to be more than human. It was with considerable interest therefore that I heard from Dr. Randle, the Librarian of the India Office Library in London, that he has got a bunch of letters of the reign of Tipu Sultan in his archive. This was in August, 1939. As I was at that time very busy with my arrangements to return to India, Dr. Randle was kind enough to send them to the University Library, Calcutta through the Government of Bengal. Since my return to India in October, 1939, I have had time to go through these letters and I read a brief description of their nature and contents before the History Section of the All India Oriental conference held at Tirupati (Madras) during the Easter holidays last year.

These letters⁵ are contained, along with some other letters and papers on different subjects, in a big volume nearly 16×12 inches in size bound with leather at the back and corners. The papers in the collection herein noticed are of different sizes and in one case of different quality. The first sheet is about 12×7 $\frac{3}{4}$ inches in size: thick white paper. Contains 23 lines of writing in French including the date and signature. The second sheet, which is exactly of the same size and quality is blank except the India Office Seal dated 31 August, 1915 and the number R & R. 2111/1915. The third sheet is 13 $\frac{1}{2}$ ×7 $\frac{3}{4}$ in size; paper rather thin and old. Quality bad; strengthened by

2. During my historical tours in these regions, I was once told by some people at Seringapatam that Tipu was a 'martyr' and that he was really poisoned by British spies through his kitchen servants. When I drew their attention to the well known picture of Tipu fighting sword in hand standing near one of his gateways at Seringapatam, they told me that it was a false one.

3. *Sketch of the war with Tipu Sultan by Roderick Mackenzie*: Lieut. 52nd. Regiment. Calcutta, 1793. It covers the period from December 1789 to February 1792. 2 Vols.

4. *Historical Sketches of the South of India*, in an attempt to trace the History of Mysoor; From the origin of the Hindoo Government of that State to the extinction of the Mohammedan Dynasty in 1799. By Colonel Mark Wilks, London, 1820; 3 Vols.

5. MSS. Eur. F. 18/1.

thin slips of gummed paper on three sides and also in one place on the 4th side and upper middle portion. It contains 27 lines of writing in what appears to be a Shikasteh variety of the Persian script. The 4th sheet is similar to the 1st and 2nd in size and quality. It contains 78 lines of writing in French, 37 lines in front and 41 lines on the back (including date and signature). The 5th, 6th and 7th sheets constitute one complete letter. Quality of paper as in the first, but the size of the sheets is uniformly $14\frac{1}{4} \times 9\frac{1}{2}$. The front page of the first sheet contains 22 lines in French in small hand on the left margin. The rest of the space on the right contains 19 lines of French writing and in addition in the centre a circular chronogramme containing 11 lines of writing. The characters are of various sizes. The reverse side of this sheet contains about 29 lines of writing in French. The 6th sheet contains 64 lines of French writing, 31 on the front side and 33 on the back. In addition, there are 7 lines of writing in smaller characters on the top of the left margin. The 7th sheet contains 31 lines of French writing on the front page, the reverse side being blank except the usual India Office Library Seal and no. referred to above. The 8th and the 9th sheets constitute one separate letter. The front side of the 8th sheet is similar to that of the 5th with the same chronogramme and explanatory note on the middle left margin. The rest of the left margin is blank except two lines of writing on the top. The space on the left of this margin, in addition to the chronogramme referred to above, contains 20 lines of French writing in varying types of letters. The reverse side contains 32 lines of writing in French. The 9th sheet contains 8 lines of similar writing. Its reverse side is blank except the usual India Office Seal and no. referred to above. In quality of paper these two sheets are similar to the sheets 5th-7th, but in size they are slightly smaller.

A brief summary of the contents of these papers is given below :

(I) The first sheet is the French translation of a letter written in Persian by the ambassadors (apparently of Tipu Sultan) to the Grand Vizir of the French King (apparently Louis XVI). It acknowledges the receipt of a dispatch from the French minister announcing the appointment of the royal interpreter for Oriental languages to assist the Mysore embassy in giving replies to official communications (apparently in French) and in general in the matter of negotiations with the French court. While agreeing with this arrangement, the letter politely informs the minister that the embassy has its own interpreter and that on the occasion of the royal audience discussion would proceed through the agency of this Mysore official. Further the letter requests that all letters and communica-

tions (intended for the embassy) might be drawn up in Persian (and apparently not in French). For "we shall understand them sooner." This letter is dated 28th July, 1788 at Paris.

(II) The 3rd sheet : Persian Letter : The letter is addressed to (one) Khan Sahib, the "affectionate and kind friend" of the writer. It refers to the fact that the addressee together with friends had sometime ago crossed the seas and having reached France was received with "pomp and honour" on behalf of the King (*Badshah*). This news had given great pleasure to the writer and he now expects that after having been received in audience by the King of France and after having fulfilled his objects the Khan Sahib would soon return (to India). The writer proceeds to say that he had before this written 5 or 6 letters to the addressee but has as yet received no reply. Due to his devotion and zeal for the Government of France, he was now "in the path of great danger." But he was determined to persevere in his efforts for the service of France. He was working as the *Diwan* for the King of France in whose affairs there had recently cropped up some trouble. The writer had done all he could in connection with the erection of the fortress of Sipār. Previously his brother Kandap Madley had been the *Diwān* and after his death he succeeded to the office. The General Musi Konwey⁶ Bahadur had now taken him in his retinue and he has been presented with a *Palki*, *afstabgri*⁷ *patta* etc. He now requested the Khan Sahib that he should persuade his majesty the King of France to grant him the formal letter of appointment (*parwānah-i-khās*) with the royal seal and signature together with the robe of honour. These, the Khan Sahib should either bring with himself or send them on a Company's ship to either General Mūsī Konwai or to M. de Morison at this place. He writes on another matter. In the days of M. Lally 50,000 rupees (*rūpiā*) had been taken (apparently) for the Company. This amount has not yet been returned. Would the Khan Sahib exercise his good offices in this matter also so that an order might be secured from his majesty for the return of the amount to one who is entitled to it? The letter closes with "respectful obeisance to Akbar Alī Khan Sahib⁸ and to Muhammad Osman Sahib.⁹ (The letter does not preserve any date or the name of the writer or the addressee¹⁰).

6. General Conway, Governor of Pondicheri (1788). See Wilks, *op. cit.*, Vol. III., P. 10.

7. Umbrella.

8. One of the three members of Tipu's embassy to the French Court in 1787-88

9. Sometimes known as Othman Khan.

See Wilks, *op. cit.*, Vol. III, p. 52. fn.

10. This possibly shows that this Persian document is not the original

(III) Translation of a Persian letter addressed to Muhammad Dervich Khan, the first ambassador of Tipu Sultan, by the Diwan or Interpreter of the King at Pondichery. In the superscription it is dated on the 17th day of Djemaziulsani, the year of the Hijra 1203¹¹. (It appears to be rather a free French translation of the previous letter in Persian.¹² We are told at the end that it was) translated by order of the chief minister of the French King by the Secretary for Oriental Languages attached to the court of Versailles on 24. VII. 89.

(IV) This is a French translation of a dispatch in Persian from Tipu Sultan to the Emperor of France. After the usual preliminaries, it acknowledges the receipt of two dispatches, one through the intermediary of his (Tipu's) ambassadors and the other by the hand of "the very exalted Commandant of the Ocean of your Imperial Majesty M. le Count of Macnémara¹³. It then refers with thanks to the despatch by the French King of various artists and workmen with the party of the ambassadors. It then proceeds to complain of the conduct of M. de Bussy.¹⁴ The letter ascribes his unsatisfactory conduct to his infirmities due to old age. It then acknowledges the receipt of the welcome news that M. de Cossigny¹⁵ had been promoted to the position of Marechal de Camp by the addressee on the recommendation of the writer. The letter then refers to the mission of M. le Count de Macnémara, Commandant of the French Naval Forces in India to the Court of the writer. It next refers to the admittance to Royal audience of the artists and workmen sent by the French King. The letter then again refers to the deplorable conduct of M. de Bussy and acknowledges with thanks the renewed affirmations of friendship by the French King which was "too old and too solid" to be shaken by the English, the "universal disturber." It then refers to the French troops at Pondichery retiring to the Isle of France¹⁶ and the multiplication of embassies between the two courts. At that moment, we are told, the heroes of Islam were engaged in repressing the violators of treaties (i.e. the English). The writer then requests the French King

letter. Or is it possible that such letters were sent during this period to escape detection in case letters fell into the hands of enemies?

11. Jemad-as-Sani Hijra 1203 would be approximately March 1789.

12. See above No. II.

13. See Wilks, *Op. cit.*, Vol. III, p. 64. Macnémara was received by Tipu shortly before his departure from Travancore in 1790.

14. The well known French general.

15. French Governor of Pondichery who later on resided in Isle of France (Mauritius).

16. Island of Mauritius.

to send him 2000 French soldiers from Pondicheri and the Isle of France. The Mysore state would bear all their expenses. The letter then again refers to the visit and reception of the Count of Macnémara at the court of the writer and the mutual exchange of presents. On his return the French envoy, we are told, would give an accurate account of "our most secret thoughts." Dated 9th Chaāban, Hezira 1204. Translated on 30. I. 1791.

(V) This is the French translation of a Persian despatch from Tipu Sultan to the Count de la Luzerne, Vizir of the Emperor of France. The letter refers to the warm reception of the Mysore ambassadors at the Court of Paris. It then refers to the jealousy of the English, "who love discord" and the urgent need of 2000 French troops "ready to march under our command against the common enemy." In case this was done the adversaries of the allies would feel much discouraged. The writer relied on the support of the French Vizir to this plan. The letter then refers to some presents, the "products of our dominions" to the French minster which Tipu was sending with the Count of Macnémara. Written on 9th Chaaban, Hezira 1204. Translated on 31. I. 1791.

I am now publishing the text of the various letters and their translations. As the reading of the Persian letter is rather uncertain in a few places, and as I am not sure that the Persian text when printed would be quite correct, I am publishing a plate of the original letter. The language of the letter shows that the writer was not very learned in the Persian tongue. The style of the French letters is rather ornate and archaic and the orthography is peculiarly old in some places. In spite of my efforts to give a literal translation of the letters, I found it impossible always to strictly adhere to the letter of the text. I have taken the liberty of correcting a few mistakes, mainly of accents, in the French text.

It is my intention to comment in some detail on the importance and historical significance of the letters on some future date.*

*In publishing these letters I have received material assistance from a number of my friends. But for their assistance it would have been impossible for me to publish the documents so quickly, burdened as I am with many other duties. Among these I must mention the names of Dr. Batakrishna Ghosh, Father Dontaine, S. J.; Prof. M. Ismail, Prof. M. Mahfuz-ul Haq, Prof. Shah Kalimur Rahaman, Prof. Ibrahim Shibli and Mr. P. Mazumdar. I take this opportunity to thank them all for their kind assistance.

[illegible]

TEXT

I

TRADUCTION DE LA RÉPONSE PERSANNE DES AMBASSADEURS À MONSIEUR.

À Son Excellence, le Grand Vizier, Monsieur le Ministre que le très Saint le Conserve !

Votre sublime Dépêche nous est parvenue avec M. Ruffin ; et nous avons pris connaissance de son contenu. Vous nous avez mandé que M. Ruffin avoit été choisi par Sa M^{te} pour discuter les affaires, faire les demandes et les réponses, déterminer les négociations. Sur ce point votre choix est le nôtre ; et tous les points seront conclus par l'entremise de M. Ruffin ; mais nous avons avec nous un interprète. Ce sera par son organe que la discussion dans l'audience aura lieu. Toutes les fois que vous aurez occasion de nous honorer de vos lettres, daignez nous les faire remettre en Persan. Nous les comprendrons plutôt. A quoi serviroit une plus longue réponse ?

il n'y a point de signature. Les trois Cachets sont sur l'enveloppe ainsi que l'adresse.

Traduit par moi soussigné Secrétaire Interprète du Roy pour les Langues Orientales à Paris le 28 : juillet 1788 ./.

Ruffin

II

خانصاحب مشفق مہربان قدر دان تفضل گستر نیازمندان سلمہ اللہ تعالیٰ
بد تمنا سے آرزوئے مواصلت کثیر المباحثات لاتعد ولا تحصى است-مہربان ضمیر
منیر می گردانند درینولا آنقدر دان بامزوم صاحب نوازش فرما و با مردمان رفقاء
بخیر و عافیت و صحت مزاج تمام باطنی منازل در یاد رسال گزشتہ داخل و لایت فرانس
گردیدند در آن وقت از طرف بادشاہ در آنجا عزت و حرمت و استقبال تمام بان نوازش
فرما بعمل آورده بودند و کوالف روناد آنجا بسماعت نیازمند رسیدہ ہزاران ہزار خوشی
و خرم گوناگون شدہ و از جناب ایزدی توقع و امیدواری دارم کہ آن مہربان از ملامت
بادشاہ فرانس حاصل نمودہ و آنچه کہ مطالبات و مقاصدات خودہا ب حصول آورده
و از ہمہ امورات آنجا فراغت یا فتنہ با خوشی و خرم ترین حدود تشریف آرزانی خواہند
فرمودہ ہموںوقت نیازمند حاضر الوقت بودہ از ملامت آن غریبانواز حاصل کردہ بارزو و

تمنا ہامیدار سابق پنج وشدش خطوط نوشتہ فرستادہ بودم۔ کاغز مذکور نزد آن صاحب رسید یا نا رسید و صدر جواب خطوط تالے الان بوقع نیامدہ۔ نیازمند در امور سرکار پادشاہ فرانس بسیار حفاظت و آزرہ خوف کے مامور درین جا بعضہ صاحبان خدمت کنندگان در سرکار پادشاہ فرانس بموجب مامورہ امر حاضر باشی می نمایند۔ بخاطر آنها خوشی و خرم بایشد۔ همچنین دارفرمان برداری آنها حاضر می باشم و بان صاحب روشی آست و آئندہ درکار ہا عہ مامورہ پادشاہ فرانس بچہ عنوان بودہ با باشد لائق سرپرہکار و سر انجام دادن بخدمت دیوانی با تمام وجہ لائق باشد۔ بہم عنوان خداوندان اینجا واضح آست درین باب پیش آرم باز صاحب نوشتہ بودم و سوا عہ این در امور پادشاہ فرانس کارہا عہ ہنگامہ روانہ ہوں۔ در آن وقت نیازمند در باب تیار نمودن قلمہ سپار سعی و کوشش و درین امور ترددات بعمل آوردہ ہوں۔ جنرل کوند موتہ کنوہ بہادر برائے خدمت دیوانی فرانس کار خود انستہ و نظر توجہات و بر رفاقت ہموای آوداشتہ برخوردار نیازمند کینہل پلہتے مری نامی راجا لکی و افتاب گری و پڑہ وغیرہ بر احوال نیازمند مبدول می نمودہ ہوں۔ آرتین معنے کارہائے مضی ماضی اطلاع بان مہربان نمودن ضرور دانستہ ارقام نورم در آیام موسی لائے کے در کمپنی مبلغ پنجہ ہزار روپیہ گرفتہ ہوں۔ تالے الان سبیل رسانیدن زر مند کوند نمودن و این معنی بان مہربان ترقیم نمودہ ہوں۔ بایں کے آزرہ توجہات دلی در کمپنی مذکور در باب وصول زر سوال و جواب نمودہ حکم حضور چنان گرفتہ عنایت فرمایند کے زر مذکور بلا عذر و حرکت با حق دار عاید و مرحمت گردن۔ سابق در سرکار فرانس برادر کمپ مدے دیوان بودہ و ہن فوٹے آو خدمت دیوانی بنام نیازمند ثبوت گردید۔ نیازمند در امور سرکار فرانس کارروائی و سر انجام دادن بہرکار حاضر می باشم۔ لازم آنست کے قابلیت و لیاقت و دانائی نیزمند در باب کارہائے خدمت دیوانی بحضور پادشاہ فرانس ظاہر گرد۔ پروانہ خاص بامہر نسخہ و معہ خلعت و تشریف آرخضور حاصل کردہ ہمراہ خودیا برجہاز کمپنی ک در اینجا می آید۔ آرتنا و خدا عے جہاز گفت و شنود نمودہ حوالہ ساختہ بگویند ک این آشیائے نزد جنرال کوند موسی کنوہ بہادر یا موسی میس نیتاتان حوالہ سازند۔ این احسان را ہزارہا احسان خواہم دانست و تائب گوراین معنی را فراموش تکواہم کرد۔ نیازمند بموجب فرمودن آن مہربان بعمل خواہم آورد۔ زمانہ بجز نوازش و توجہات چہ بر طراز بخدمت فیض مرتبت اکبر علی خان صاحب و محمد عثمان صاحب سلام شوق مہر او موصوف باد

III

TRADUCTION D'UNE LETTRE PERSANNE ADRESSÉE
 À MOUHAMMED DERVICH KHAN 1^{er} AMBASSADEUR
 DE TYPOU SULTAN PAR LE DIVAN OU L'INTERPRÈTE
 DU ROI À PONDICHÉRY ./.

Suscription. que cette supplique parvienne en mains propres de M.
 Mouhamméd Dervich Khan, Seigneur bienfaisant &
 Généreux envers ses serviteurs, Amb^r. de l'Empereur victorieux Typou
 Sultan, que Dieu le Conserve !

écrit le 17 : de la lune de Djémaziulsani l'an de l'hégire 1203 ./.

Très bienfaisant Seigneur & c^a,

Après vous avoir offert mes vœux et le désir, que j'ai constamment de
 jouir encore de la satisfaction infinie de vous voir ; j'ai l'honneur de
 vous notifier que votre heureuse arrivée en France, après avoir tra-
 versé les mers en très bonne santé sur le vaisseau de M. Monneron
 avec votre nombreux Cortège ; et la réception honorable et distinguée,
 qui vous a été faite par l'Empereur de France dès votre entrée sur les
 terres de son Empire ; tous ces détails sont déjà parvenus à notre Con-
 noissance. Nous en avons tous ressenti ici la plus grande joie et j'ai
 en mon particulier demandé à l'être Suprême que vous obtinssiez
 bientôt une audience de ce monarque, et l'effet de toutes les instances
 que vous devez faire auprès de lui sur les objet de votre mission. J'es-
 père qu'aucun ne souffrira ni difficulté ni retard et que vous reviendrez
 dans peu chargé d'honneurs et comblé de bienfaits. Je me flatte aussi
 que le Ciel me conservera pour avoir le bonheur de vous revoir.

J'ai eu déjà l'avantage de vous écrire cinq à six fois. J'ignore si mes
 lettres vous sont parvenues ou non ; mais il est certain que je n'en
 ai reçu aucune réponse jusqu'à présent.

Je suis dans une position très précaire, quant aux fonctions que je
 remplis ici. Je dépends absolument des officiers supérieurs. Ils me
 le font sentir et il faut que je n'en montre point d'humeur. Aussi
 ne témoigné-je jamais que zèle et soumission. Vous l'avez vu vous-
 même ; et à l'avenir, je ferai toujours de même, quelque soit le titre,
 sous lequel je serai employé au service de l'Empereur de France.
 Tous les officiers Généraux d'ici me reconnoissent pour le Divan.
 C'étoit dans ce sens que je vous en avois écrit. Je vous rendois en
 même tems un compte fidèle de tout ce qui se passoit dans ces con-
 trées et de mes efforts pour les dispositions relatives à la forteresse de

Sipar, ainsi que des oppositions, que j'avois éprouvées sur plusieurs points.

M. le Général Gouverneur C^{te} de Canwai considérant comme sa propre affaire la nomination et le choix du Divan et m'ayant fait l'honneur de me prendre à sa suite, m'a fait accorder le Palanquin et toutes les distinctions honorifiques. Je n'ai qu'à me louer de ses bontés. C'est pour cela que je vous avois marqué que le passé devoit être oublié.

Dans le tems de M. Delally, j'avois à réclamer de la Compagnie cinquante mille roupies et depuis lors, cette somme ne m'a point été restituée. Je vous faisais également part de cette réclamation. Je vous prie de la rappeler à la Compagnie et d'en faire mention à Sa M^{te} Impériale, de manière à ce qu'il en émane l'ordre formel que cet argent soit rendu à qui il appartient.

Mon frère m'avoit précédé dans la place de Divan et elle me fut accordée à sa mort. Je suis prêt à la remplir, comme je l'ai déjà fait, avec la plus grande activité : on ne doit point douter de mon zèle. C'est à vous de faire connoître à l'Empereur ma bonne volonté, mon expérience et mes talents pour cet emploi, et de m'obtenir un diplôme, de la propre main du Monarque, et scellé du sceau de l'Empire, ainsi que l'investiture d'honneur et le traitement pécuniaire. Vous auriez la bonté de prendre tout cela avec vous, ou de l'envoyer ici par quelque navire de la Compagnie en recommandant cet envoi au Capitaine et en l'adressant à M. le Général de Canwai ou à M. de Moranin Intendant.

Je regarderois cette faveur de votre part comme plus précieuse que mille autres et je ne l'oublierois point jusqu'au Tombeau. Je suis à vos ordres ici et je vous prie de présenter mes respects à Akbar Aly Khan et à Mouhammed Osman Khan. A quoi serviroient de plus longs détails ?./.

Traduit d'ordre de Monseigneur par moi soussigné
Secrétaire Interprète du Roi pour les Langues Ori-
entales à la suite de la Cour à Versailles le 24 : 7bre
1789 ./.

Ruffin

INDIA OFFICE

31 AUG 1915

LIBRARY

R & R 2111/1915

IV

TRADUCTION DE LA DÉPÊCHE

PERSANNE DE TYPOU SULTAN
AU ROY

Elle est sur quatre feuilles
séparées, dont il n'y a
d'écrit que les *fogli*° *recto*.

Suscription Extérieure

A L'Empereur de France

Légende Persanne et Arabe du grand Sceau
extérieur

Chronogramme

*N^a. Les lettres de l'Alphabet arabe sont autant de signes numériques. En additionnant toutes celles, qui composent le passage cité, l'on trouve un total de 1169 (qui répond à l'année 7121 : de l'Ère-Indienne), que la Puissance de Hayder Ali commença à être reconnu dans l'Inde. Typou Sultan naquit à la même époque. Les orientaux sont fort jaloux de cette espèce de combinaisons chronogrammatiques.

L'an du monde

*7121 :

Mon anneau est devenu supérieur
aux Disques du Soleil et de la Lune
depuis que ma naissance, sous le règne
de mon père Chah Hayder Sultan, se
trouve prédite par le passage du Coran,
où il est dit

Je suis votre fils l'Empereur Universel-
lement reconnu

Légende du petit sceau intérieur

7121 :

Typou Sultan

Suscription intérieure

*Le mot *Roy* est conservé dans le persan.

Puisse-t-elle parvenir (cette dépêche) aux nobles regards de Sa Majesté le Très Sublime, très Auguste Souverain des climats de l'Europe, la Colonne des Monarques Glorieux, l'Empereur **Roi* de France Louis seize, que le très haut conserve ses précieux jours !

Frontispice de la dépêche
Un soleil portant le nom
en chiffre de Tipou Sultan
fils de Hayder Ali Kan

Répétition des mêmes titres contenus dans la suscription

Avant tout nous offrons à Votre Majesté Impériale le juste tribut de notre respect et de notre haute estime, et nous nous acquitons envers Elle de toutes les obligations, que ses sentiments nous imposent.

Qu'il nous soit ensuite permis d'annoncer à Votre Majesté Impériale l'heureuse arrivée de ses nobles dépêches ; dont les expressions pleines de bonté et de générosité connoissent si bien le chemin du cœur de son ami, y pénètrent comme un parfum exquis, et lui donnent une nouvelle existence. Ces deux lettres nous sont parvenues, l'une par l'entremise de nos Ambassadeurs, et l'autre par les mains du très excellent Commandant de Mer de Votre Majesté Impériale M. le C^{te} de Macnémara.

La plume de l'amitié semble les avoir tracés, l'oeil de l'intérêt le plus vif, les a lues avec avidité, et la perception de la reconnaissance a saisi et gardera précieusement les preuves touchantes de la bienveillance, qui caractérise chaque ligne de ces Diplômes,

“Votre Majesté nous notifie, elle même, l’expédition faite à la suite de nos Ambassadeurs d’une grande partie des artistes de différents genres que nous lui avons demandée, et l’envoy subséquent et très prochain des ouvriers dont nous avons encore besoin. Elle nous indique et le prix que nous devons mettre à ce Dépôt de l’Amitié, et le premier devoir de tous les souverains, en nous disant qu’elle considère ces françois comme ses propres enfants.

“Sa Majesté Impériale daigne nous rendre des témoignages favorables de la conduite de nos Ambassadeurs.

“Elle nous engage à n’attribuer le procédé peu mesuré, et dont nous nous étions plaints de feu M. de Bussy, qu’à son age avancé et à ses infirmités, qui dès lors commençoient à affaiblir son énergie ; explication, qui avoit été donnée de vive voix à nos Ambassadeurs.

“Elle a la bonté de nous parler de l’avancement de M. de Cossigny qui doit son nouveau grade de Maréchal de Camp à notre recommandation.

“Elle nous prévient enfin de la mission particulière auprès de nous de M. Le C^{te} de Macnémara Commandant de ses forces navales dans l’Inde, qui avoit ordre de se rendre à notre Cour, de nous offrir de la part de Sa Majesté Impériale quelques marques de son souvenir, et de conférer avec nous sur nos intérêts respectifs.

Les Artistes et les Ouvriers françois ont été en effect admis à notre audience, et nous avons pour eux des yeux et des soins paternels, parce que nous avons compris toute la profondeur de ce que Votre Majesté Impériale nous dit à leur égard. Nous la prions d’être parfaitement tranquille sur cet article. Pleins de confiance dans ses promesses, nous en attendons les heureux effects, et l’arrivée successive de la partie de ces hommes utiles, qui doit compléter le nombre porté dans l’état cy joint.

Quelques disposés que nous fussions déjà à imputer à la vieillesse de M. de Bussy et à l’affaïssement de son moral, sa conduite déplacée contraire aux intentions pures et loyales de Votre Majesté Impériale il nous a été bien doux d’en tenir l’aveu d’elle même, il a achevé notre conviction. Les fondements de la bonne intelligence, et de l’amitié, qui règnent entre Votre Majesté Impériale et nous, sont trop anciens et trop solides pour qu’ils puissent être ébranlés par un faux mouvement de pareils esprits aussi inconsidérés, malgré les efforts de l’Anglois, ce perturbateur universel, qui, pour rompre les liens de notre union, ne cesse, pour ainsi dire, de mettre les fers au feu. Aujourd’huy surtout qu’il voit, d’une part, les troupes françoises se retirer de Pondichéry à l’Isle de France, et de l’autre, les Ambassades se multiplier entre nos deux Cours, l’injuste jalousie de notre ennemi

commun l'a porté à des voyes de fait ; mais, Graces au Très Haut, la Puissance de la maison du **Lion de Dieu* est en état d'opposer à l'Anglois des forces nombreuses d'hommes et de chevaux, et un appareil formidable de guerre. Dans ce moment même, les héros de l'Islamisme sont lancés dans le champ de l'honneur ; et occupés à réprimer les infracteurs des traités. Cependant quelque juste que soit notre cause, n'en pas présumer est d'une sage prévoyance ; et celle ci me paroît exiger aussi impérieusement que les sentiments qui nous unissent à votre Majesté Impériale,

une marche éventuelle. Nous la supplions donc d'enjoindre formellement et dès à présent à ses Commandants de Pondichéry et de l'Isle de France que, sur notre réquisition, ils nous envoient deux mille combattants ; et de leur recommander de ne se permettre ni excuse ni délai, mais de se tenir prêts à se rendre au signal et à obéir à nos ordres. Quant aux fraix de l'expédition, et aux approvisionnements tout leur sera fourni abondamment par notre Sublime Cour, et l'expérience du passé ne leur doit laisser aucune espèce d'inquiétude sur ce point essentiel. Votre Majesté Impériale peut-etre persua... qu' aussitôt que les opérations de la Campagne seront terminées, nous serons attentifs à renvoyer avec honneur ces troupes auxiliaires à leur première destination. Au surplus la précision des ordres, que nous sollicitons, nous a paru seule capable d'assurer le succès des entreprises les plus avantageuses aux deux alliés et l'entière défaite de leurs adversaires. Nous soumettons ce plan à la sagesse et à la supériorité des lumières de Votre Majesté Impériale.

M. Le C^{te} de Macnémara nous a remis les objects rares et précieux, que Votre Majesté Impériale lui avoit consignées pour nous, et il nous a transmis avec la même fidélité tout ce qu'elle l'avoit chargé de nous dire. Nous lui avons fait l'accueil et les honneurs qui sont dus au représentants d'un grand Monarque et à l'exemple de Votre Majesté Impériale, nous lui avons accordé la plus intime confiance. Il pourra à son retour lui rendre un compte exact de nos plus secrettes pensées.

C'est un homme de grand mérite, et un officier Général aussi habile que zélé. Il est plus propre que tout autre à remplir les vues de Votre Majesté Impériale dans l'Indostan. Les commissions importantes et délicates, que Votre Majesté Impériale pourroit lui confier dans cette partie du monde, seroient pour nous autant de nouveaux motifs de reconnoissance. La promotion de M. de Cossigny d'après

l'intérêt que nous avons témoigné prendre à son sort, nous a fait le plus grand plaisir.

Que Votre Majesté Impériale nous permette de lui faire, agréer en même temps que notre réponse un léger hommage des productions de nos climats, et un foible gage de nos sentiments respectueux, dans troix bijoux et 21 *khi'lat* ou vêtements d'honneur que M. le C^{te} de Macnémara aura celui de lui offrir en notre nom, et dont la note se trouve cy jointe. Si Votre Majesté Impériale daigne jeter un regard favorable sur ces envoy, elle mettra le comble à notre satisfaction. Nous espérons qu'elle continuera de nous honorer de ses bontés. Dans l'éloignement où nous sommes de Votre Majesté Impériale, la correspondance est un supplément à la jouissance dont nous sommes privés. Ne laissons donc échapper aucune occasion de nous entretenir au moins par lettre et par messages.

Puisse Votre Majesté Impériale jouir d'un bonheur inaltérable !

Ecrit le neuvième jour de la lune de Chaaban, l'an de l'hégire 1204./.

Traduit sur l'Original Persan par moi soussigné
Secrétaire Interprète du Roy en Langues Orientales à la suite de la Cour à Paris le 30 : Juillet
1791./.

Ruffin

V

Elle est sur une seule feuille écrite des deux côtés.

TRADUCTION DE LA DÉPÊCHE PERSANNE DE TYPOU SULTAN

A M. LE C^{te} DE LA LUZERNE

Suscription extérieure

A M. Le C^{te} de la Luzerne Vizir de l'Empereur de France. Légende Persanne et Arabe du grand sceau extérieur

Chronogramme

N les lettres de l'alphabet arabe sont autant de signes numériques. En additionnant toutes celles qui composent le passage cité, l'on trouve un total de 1169 : ce fut probablement l'an de l'hégire 1169 (qui répond à l'année 7121. de l'Ère Indienne) que la puissance de Hayder Ali commença à être reconnue dans l'Inde. Typou Sultan naquit à la même époque. Les Orientaux sont fort jaloux de cette espèce de combinaisons chronogrammatiques.

L'an du monde

*7121 :

Mon anneau est devenu supérieur
aux Disques du Soleil et de la Lune,
depuis que ma naissance, sous le règne
de mon père Chah Hayder Sultan, se
trouve prédite par le passage du Coran,
où il est dit

Je suis votre fils l'Empereur Universel-
lement reconnu

Légende du petit sceau intérieur

7121 :

Typou Sultan

Suscription intérieure

Puisse-t-elle (cette dépêche) être vue par son
Excellence le très honorable, très Puissant,
très estimable Seigneur l'appui de ses amis,
M. Le C^{te} de la Luzerne Vizir de l'Empe-
reur de France que Dieu le conserve !

Frontispice de la dépêche.

Un soleil d'Argent portant le
nom en chiffre de Typou Sultan
fils de Hayder Aly Khan

Répétition des mêmes titres contenus
dans la suscription.

Nous avons été singulièrement satisfaits de la relation que nos Ambassadeurs nous ont faite de vos bontés, et de vos nobles procédés. Elle ne nous laisse rien à désirer sur vos dispositions ultérieures à resserrer de plus les noeuds indissolubles de l'intimité qui règne entre les deux Cours.

Cette précieuse harmonie, dont l'Univers a été le témoin, est naturellement un objet de jalousie pour l'Anglois, qui aime la discorde, et n'est occupé que du soin de l'introduire partout où il le peut. Quoique la divine Providence nous ait donné des troupes nombreuses et des moyens formidables de défense, et que les héros de l'Islamisme soient déjà en état de contenir notre ennemi commun, cependant par une sage prévoyance, et toujours fondés sur l'estime, dont Sa Majesté l'Empereur Roi de France nous honore, nous avons cru devoir le prier d'enjoindre à ses Généraux de Pondichery et de l'Isle de France qu'ils eussent à nous envoyer, au premier signal de notre part, deux mille soldats prêts à marcher sous notre commandement. Nous sommes persuadés que vous voudrés bien vous même adopter cette mesure. Sa publicité peut seule opérer les meilleurs effets pour les deux alliés et le découragement absolu de leurs adversaires ; nous comptons sur votre concours à l'exécution d'un plan, dont le succès dépend essentiellement de la précision des ordres, que vous donnerez à vos Commandants. Les avantages respectifs qui doivent en résulter pour les deux Empires n'échapperont pas à votre sagacité et à votre longue expérience, dont nous avons conçu la plus haute comme la plus juste idée. Aussi sommes nous très empressés de cultiver votre correspondance, et nous vous prions de croire que ce sera toujours avec un vrai plaisir que nous recevrons vos lettres et vos messages. Les sentiments, que vous nous avés inspirés, nous font un devoir, dont nous nous acquittons bien volontiers, de vous offrir quelques productions de nos états. M. Le C^{te} de Macnémara aura l'honneur de vous remettre en notre nom une chaîne de diamants et de rubis et quatre *khilaat* ou vêtements d'honneur, tels qu'ils sont énoncés dans l'état descriptif cy joint. Nous apprendrons avec joie qu'ils vous sont heureusement parvenus.

Puissies vous jouir d'une prospérité inaltérable !

Ecrit le 9^{me} jour de la lune de Chaaban l'an de l'hégire 1204./.

Traduit sur l'Original Persan par moi soussigné
Secrétaire Interprète du Roy en Langues Orientales à Paris le 31 : janvier 1791./.

TRANSLATION

I

TRANSLATION OF THE PERSIAN REPLY OF THE AMBASSADORS TO MONSEIGNEUR.¹

To his Excellency The Grand Vizir, the Minister, may the Exalted One (God) preserve him.

Your sublime dispatch has reached us through M. Ruffin ; and we have taken cognizance of its contents. You have informed us that M. Ruffin has been chosen by his majesty for discussing business, to question and receive answers and conduct the negotiations. On this point we accept your choice ; and all the points will be concluded through the intermediary of M. Ruffin ; but we have with us an interpreter. It will be through his agency that the discussion in the audience shall take place. Whenever you may have occasion to honour us with your letters, draw it up in Persian. We shall understand them sooner. What purpose will be served by longer replies.

*There is no signature, the three seals are on the envelope as also the address. Translated by me—the undersigned Secretary Interpreter to the King for Oriental Languages at Paris the 28 :
July 1788%

Ruffin.

II

Khan Sahib, my affectionate and kind friend and knower of value and the spreader of favours to the humble-selves. May God keep you in peace. After unlimited and countless desires and longing for meeting you with brimful conviviality which are obviously known to

1. My lord, Your grace etc.

*These four lines were apparently added by Ruffin and were not in the original Persian letter.

your enlightened self, you now know this much that the showerer of favours, having crossed the seas last year together with kind friends and people reached France quite safe and sound. At that time a rousing reception was given with pomp and honour on behalf of the king² to that showerer of favours (*M. Munrum*); the proceedings and incidents (of this affair) reached the ears of this humble self. I became a thousand times happy and from God I expect and hope that your kind self having obtained (audience) for your service of the French king³ and after fulfilling whatever aims and objects you had and after finishing all those affairs with happiness and gladness you will graciously return here. At that time (my) humble self will be present there, in the service of that nourisher of the poor, (i.e., yourself) with hopes and expectations. Previously, having written 5 or 6 letters, I had sent (them); whether the above mentioned papers have reached you or not (I do not know); and the reply to those letters has not been received as yet. My humble self takes great care in the (service of the) Government of the king of France and (in consequence) is in the path of great danger. Here some of the higher officials⁴ in the Government of the king of France in accordance with their post⁵ make me carry out their orders. One should be happy and cheerful for their sake. As such I am always ready at their service; it is obvious to you. And in future I shall serve in any post⁶ befitting me in the Government of the king of France. All the officers here are aware that I am working as the Diwān with all worthy means (i.e. with fervour and zeal). Previously I had also written to you about this. Besides this, some troubles have cropped up in the affairs of the king of France. At that time this humble self, in connection with the erection of the fortress of Sipār and in these troublesome affairs, exercised efforts and endeavours. The general Count Mūsī Konweh Bahadur, for the office of the Diwān of France, considering it his own affairs, has favoured me by accepting me into his companionship (retinue).⁷ Nipal Plati Madley (?) presented me with a Pālkī and an umbrella, (*paṭṭah*)⁷ and so on. He had showered upon my humble self favours and kindnesses. In connection with some of these past affairs, the information of which I consider it to be necessary to give you, it had been

2. *Badshah*.

3. *Badshah-i-France*.

4. Literally "officials who make others work."

5. Official position.

6. *Unwān*.

7. *Aftābgri*,

written (by me). In the days of M. Lally, 50,000 rupees (*rūpīa*) had been taken for the Company; till now (there has been) found no way of getting the said amount (back). And this had been written to your good self. By way of hearty (personal!) favour, after making enquiries and answering them in the (affairs of the) said company about the realisation of the above amount and having secured the order of His majesty, the said amount may reach one who is entitled to it. Previously in the government of France (Sarkar-i-France) my brother Kandap Madley had been the Diwān and after his death the office of the Diwān was assigned to my humble self. My humble self is always prepared to do the work of the government of the king of France. It is essential that the ability, wisdom and talent of this humble self in the affairs of the office of the Diwān should be made known to His majesty, the king of France; and (that I should) obtain the royal letter of appointment⁸ with the seal and signature together with the robe of honour. Either (bring them) with you here; or (send them) on a ship of the company coming here; (in the latter case) after having a talk with the Captain of the ship and entrusting it to him—tell him that these things may be handed over to either General Mūsī Konwai or to M. de Morison Naitatan. I shall regard this favour of yours as thousands of obligations. I shall not forget this to the last day of my life. My humble self will act according to your orders. What more can I write asking your favour. And convey my respectful obeisance to Akbar 'Alī Khān Sahib and to Muḥammad Osman Sahib.

III

TRANSLATION OF A PERSIAN LETTER ADDRESSED TO MOUHAMMED DERVISH KHAN, THE FIRST AMBASSADOR OF TIPU SULTAN, BY THE DIWAN OR INTERPRETER OF THE KING AT PONDICHERI.

Suscription : May this prayer reach the proper hand of M. Mouhammed Dervich Khan, seigneur generous benefactor to-

8. *Parwānah-i-Khās*,

wards his servants, Ambr. of the victorious emperor Tipu Sultan, may God preserve him ! Written on the 17th day of the month of Djemaziulsani, the year of the Hizira 1203 %

Very beneficent Lord, etc.,

After having offered you my best wishes and the desire which I always have of still enjoying the infinite satisfaction of seeing you, I have the honour to notify you that your happy arrival in France, after having traversed the oceans in very good health on the boat of Monsieur Monneron with your numerous retinue and the honourable and distinguished reception which has been given to you by the Emperor of France on your arrival on the domains of his empire ; all these details have become known to us ; we have all felt great joy and I in particular have asked of the Supreme Being that you soon obtain an audience of this monarch and the good result of all the prayers, which you have to make to him on the objects of your mission. I hope that nobody will suffer either difficulty or delay and that you will come back soon charged with honours and burdened with favour. I hope also that heaven will preserve me to have the pleasure of seeing you again. I have already had the honour of writing to you five or six times. I do not know whether my letters have reached you or not, but it is certain that I have received no reply till the present moment. I am in a very precarious position. As for the functions which I fulfil here, I depend absolutely on the superior officers. They make me feel it and I dare show no resentment. Moreover I have never expressed anything but zeal and submission. You have seen it yourself and in future I shall do the same always whatever position in which I may be employed in the service of the emperor of France. All the General Officers of this place recognize me as the Divan. It was in this sense that I wrote to you. I return to you at the same time a faithful account of all that has transpired in these countries and of my efforts for the dispositions relating to the fortress *Sipar*, as well as of the opposition which I have encountered on several points.

M. the Governor General Count of Canwai considering as his own affair the nomination and selection of the Diwan and having honoured me by taking me into his retinue, has granted me the privilege of the Palanquin with all honorific distinctions. I have nothing but praise for his kindnesses. It is for this that I had remarked to you that the past should be forgotten. At the time of M. de Lally I had to claim from the Company 50,000 rupees and since then this sum has not been paid to me. I informed you also of this claim. I

beg you to remind the Company of this and to mention this to his imperial majesty in such a manner that he issues formal orders that this money be returned to whom it belongs.

My brother had preceded me in the office of the Diwan and it was granted to me on his death. I am willing to fill this office as I have done it before with the greatest energy. One should not doubt my zeal. It is for you to make known my good intentions, my experience and my talents for this office to the emperor, and to obtain for me a diploma from the hand of the monarch himself and stamped with the seal of the empire as also the investiture of honour and the pay attached (to the office). You will kindly bring all this with you or send it here by some ship of the Company recommending the consignment to the Captain and addressing it to the General de Canwai or to M. de Morassin, the Superintendent.

I would regard this favour from you as more precious than thousand others and I shall not at all forget it even to the last day of my life. I am at your service here. I pray you to present my respects to Akbar Aly Khan and to Mouhammad Osman Khan. What would be the use of still longer details.

Translated by order of Monseigneur by me the undersigned Secretary interpreter to the King for the Oriental languages attached to the Court of Versailles. 24. 7. 1789.

Ruffin

IV

TRANSLATION OF THE PERSIAN DESPATCH FROM TYPOU SULTAN TO THE KING

On 4 separate folios on which there is writing on only one side.

Suscription *Exterieur*¹

1. Address on the outer side.

TO THE EMPEROR OF FRANCE

Inscription of legend on the great outer seal
in Persian and Arabic.

Chronogramme

*N^a. The letters of the Arabic alphabet are numeral signs as well. By adding up all those of which the cited passage is composed, one finds a total of 1169. It was probably the year of the Hegira 1169 (which corresponds to the year 7121 of the Indian era)³ when the power of Hayder Ali commenced in India. Typou Sultan was born in the same epoch. Orientals are very appreciative of this sort of chronogrammatical combinations.

The year of the world

*7121

My seal has become superior to the discs of the sun and the moon. Since my birth under the reign of my father Shah Hayder Sultan, it is found predicted by the passage of the Qoran, where it is said :

I am your son, the Universally
recognised emperor.

Legend of the small inner seal

7121

Typou Sultan

Suscription Interieure²

May it (this despatch) arrive to the noble
sight of his very sublime majesty, very august

2. Address inside the letter.

3. This chronology seems to follow roughly the traditional chronology of the Bible. The calculation, I am told by Mr. A. Nag, was first made by Josephus, the Jewish historian and is based on the Biblical date of the creation of the human race. Ruffin seems to be wrong in regarding this as an "Indian era."

*The word Roy (i.e. King) has been preserved in Persian.

sovereign of the countries of Europe, the pillar of the glorious monarchs, the emperor, *King of France, Louis XVI, may the most high (God) conserve his precious days.

Frontispiece of the despatch

A sun bearing the name in monogramme of Typou Sultan, the son of Hayder Ali Khan. Repetition of the same titles contained in the suscription (address).

First of all we offer to your Imperial Majesty the just tribute of our respect and our high regard to whom we acknowledge all the obligations which his kindness imposes on us.

May it be permitted to ask to announce to your Imperial Majesty the happy arrival of his noble despatches, of which the expressions full of kindness and generosity know so well the way to the heart of his friend, and penetrate into it like an exquisite perfume, and give him a new life. These two letters have reached us, one through the intermediary of our ambassadors and the other by the hand of the very exalted Commander of the Sea of your imperial majesty, M. le Cte³ of Macnemara.

The pen of friendship seems to have traced them, and the eye with the most lively interest has read them with avidity, and the perception of thankfulness has seized and will preserve preciously the touching proofs of the benevolence which characterize every line of these diplomas.

Your Majesty notifies us that he has sent to us with the party of our ambassadors a large number of artists of different kinds we had asked of you, and the subsequent dispatch very shortly of workmen of whom we have still need. When his Majesty tells us that he considers these Frenchmen as his own children, he indicates to us both how high we must prize this relation of friendship and also what is the first duty of all sovereigns.

His Imperial Majesty deigns to render us favourable testimony to the conduct of our ambassadors. His Majesty asks us to attribute the rash way of the deceased M. de Bussy of which we had complained to his advanced age and his infirmities which had then begun to weaken his energy,—an explanation which was given by word of mouth to our ambassadors. His Majesty has the kindness to mention

to us of the promotion of M. de Cossigny who owes his new position of *Marechal de Camp* to our récommendation.

His Majesty informs us finally of the particular mission to us of M. Le Cte de Macnemara, Commandant of His naval forces in India, who had the order to present himself at our Court and to offer on behalf of his Imperial Majesty some token of his regard and to confer with us on the subject of our respective interests.

The French artists and the workmen have in fact been already admitted to our audience, and we have for them the eyes and care of a father because we have understood the full depth of what your Imperial Majesty says to us concerning them. We pray him to be perfectly at rest on this point. We have full faith in your promises and expect their happy fulfilment and the successive arrival of the party of these useful men, which should complete the number given in the inventory attached herewith.

However much we might have been inclined to excuse M. de Bussy on the ground of old age and the enfeeblement of his character, his deplorable conduct contrary to the pure and loyal intentions of your Imperial Majesty, it has been very gratifying to us to get confirmation of this from your Majesty and this has completed our conviction. The foundation of good understanding and friendship which reigns between your Imperial Majesty and us are too old and too solid to be capable of being shaken by the blunder of such inconsiderate spirits, inspite of the efforts of the English, the universal disturber, who in order to break the bond of our friendship, never cease, so to say, to put the irons into the fire. Today above all when he (the Englishman) sees on the one hand the French troops retiring from Pondichery to the Isle of France and on the other the embassies multiplying between our two courts, the unjust jealousy of our common enemy carries him to the path of action. But by favour of the Most

*Aly on account of his courage was called *Lion of God* by Mahomet. The father of Typou Sultan was called Hayder Aly and his dynasty make use of the surname of its patron.

High the house of the **Lion of God* is capable of arraying against the English the numerous forces of men and horses and a formidable apparatus of war. Even at this moment, the heroes of Islam have thrown themselves forward into the field of honour, and are engaged in répresseing the violators of treaties. However just our course may be, foresight forbids us presumption; and this foresight demands as imperiously as the sentiments uniting us with your Imperial

Majesty that we eventually march to attack. We entreat you therefore to give formal orders at once to your Commandants of Pondichery and

the Isle of France that on our requisition they should send us two thousand soldiers ; and to recommend to them not to allow themselves any excuse or delay, but move at the first signal ready to obey our orders.

As for the cost of the expedition and the supplies, all will be furnished to them abundantly by our sublime court and the experience of the past should not leave any anxiety on this essential point. Your Imperial Majesty may rest assured that as soon as the operations of the campaign are terminated, we shall promptly send back with honour these auxiliary troops to their first destination. Moreover the precise orders which we request you to give seem to us the only way of ensuring the success of the enterprises which will be most advantageous to both the allies and lead to the complete defeat of their adversaries. We submit this plan to the sagacity and to the superior enlightenment of your Imperial Majesty.

The Count of Macnemara has submitted to us the rare and precious things which your Imperial Majesty had confided to his care for us, and he has transmitted to us with the same fidelity all that your Majesty had charged him to tell us. We have given him the reception and honour which are due to the representative of a great monarch and following the example of your Imperial Majesty we have accorded him the most intimate confidence. On his return he can give an accurate account of our most secret thoughts. He is a man of high merit, a general officer as expert as he is zealous. He is abler than any body else to fulfil the intentions of your Imperial Majesty in Hindustan. The important and delicate commissions which your Imperial Majesty might entrust to him in this part of the world would be for us as many new grounds of gratitude. The promotion of M. de Cossigny following the interest we expressed concerning him, has given us the highest pleasure.

May your Imperial Majesty permit us to offer him, along with our reply, as a modest homage of the products of our country and as a feeble expression of our respect, three jewels and 21 khilat or dresses of honour which the Count of Macnemara will have the honour of offering you in our name and a list of which is to be found enclosed. If your Imperial Majesty deigns to throw a kindly glance on this present, it will fill to the brim our cup of satisfaction. We hope that you will continue to honour us with your kindnesses. On account of the distance at which we are from your Imperial Majesty, correspondence is the only way to make up for the pleasure of meeting of which we are deprived. Let us not miss therefore any occasion of entertaining ourselves at least by letters and messages.

May your Imperial Majesty enjoy unalterable happiness,

Written on the 9th day of the month of Chaaban, the year of the Hezira 1204.

Translated from the original Persian by me the undersigned, the Secretary interpreter to the King for Oriental languages attached to the Court of Paris, the 30th January, 1791 %

Ruffin.

V

TRANSLATION OF THE PERSIAN DESPATCH FROM
TYPOU SULTAN TO COUNT DE LA LUZERNE

Suscription Exterior

To Cte (Count) de la Luzerne, Vizir of the Emperor of France

Persian & Arabic legend of the Grand Seal
on the outer side Chronogramme

N. The letters of the Arabic alphabet are numeral signs as well. By adding up all those of which the cited passage is composed, one finds a total of 1169. It was probably the year of the Hegira 1169 (which corresponds to the year 7121 of the Indian era) when the power of Hayder Ali commenced in India. Typou Sultan was born in the same epoch. Orientals are very appreciative of this sort of chronogrammatical combinations,

The year of the world

*7121

My seal has become superior to the discs of the sun and the moon. Since my birth under the reign of my father Shah Hayder Sultan, it is found predicted by the passage of the Qoran, where it is said :

I am your son, the Universally
recognised emperor.

Legend of the small seal on the Interior

7121

Typou Sultan

Suscription Interior

May this despatch be read by His Excellency the most honourable, most powerful, most estimable Lord, the support of his friends, Count de la Luzerne, Vizir of the emperor of France, may God preserve him.

Frontispiece of the despatch

A Sun of silver bearing the name in monogramme of Typou Sultan, son of Hayder Ali Khan.

Repetition of the same titles contained in the suscription

We have been singularly satisfied with the report, which our ambassadors have submitted to us about your kindness and your noble behaviour. They leave us no room for improving on your wish to tighten more and more the unbreakable bond of friendship which exists between these two courts.

This precious harmony of which the whole universe has been witness, is naturally an object of jealousy to the English, who love discord, and are occupied only with the thought of introducing it wherever they can. Although the divine providence has given us numerous troops and formidable means of defence and although the heroes of Islam are by themselves able to check our common enemy, yet moved by a wise foresight and always relying on the esteem with which his Imperial Majesty the King of France honours us, we have thought it our duty to pray to him to order his generals of Pondichery and of the Isle of France that they should send us, at the first sign from our part, two thousand soldiers ready to march under our ~~com-~~ command. We are convinced that you yourself will be willing to adopt this measure. Its publicity can but have the best effect for the two allies and lead to the absolute discouragement of their adversaries ; we rely on your support in the execution of a plan the success of which depends essentially on the precision of the orders that you will give to your commandants. The respective advantages which should result for the two empires will not escape your sagacity and your long experience, of which we have justly formed the most exalted opinion. We are also very eager to cultivate your correspondence, and we pray you to believe that it will be always with a

true pleasure that we shall receive your letters and messages. The feelings which we have for you make it a duty of which we shall willingly acquit ourselves by offering you some products of our dominions. Count of Macnémara will have the honour of submitting to you in our name a chain of diamonds and rubies and four *Khilats* or dresses of honour, as they are mentioned in the enclosed memo. We shall be glad to hear that they have happily reached you.

May you enjoy an unalterable prosperity !

Written on the 9th day of the moon of Chaaban of the Hegira 1204.

Ruffin.

Translated from the original Persian by me the undersigned Secretary-interpreter to the King for Oriental languages attached to the Court of Paris, the 31st January, 1791 %

Ruffin.

-----: :-----

ANCIENT INDIAN GEOGRAPHY

from Tibetan Blo. rca. wa. s.

By S. C. SARKAR

[Shabs. druñ., hailing from Sum. in W. Tibet, later at ordination named Ye. še. dpal. *ahbyor.*, the famous Mkhan. po. (Abbot) of *Ahbras.* spuñs. and other important Tibetan monasteries, compiled this information, between 1722 and 1747, from early medieval writings of the Indian and Tibetan scholar translators of Indian literature into Tibetan (the Blo. rca. wa. s, c. 900–1300 A.D.), and from 'the correct opinion' of other previous writers.

This geographical summary forms only a small section of Sum. pa. Mkhan. po's well known comprehensive compilation 'Dpag. bsam. ljon. bsañ.' (or 'Bhadra-Kalpa-druma', based on ancient and early medieval Indian and Tibetan historical and religious works), and is something like a guide pamphlet to help Buddhist monks and pilgrims from Tibet wishing to visit Buddhist places of pilgrimage in India in *his* days (i.e. 2nd quarter of the 18th century, A.D.).

It would seem from Sum. pa. Mkhan. po's description that many of the most ancient sites and monuments of early and medieval Buddhist India still survived in his days,—or at least were visible in ruins on the surface, and were not abandoned or forgotten, unfrequented by pilgrims or covered by debris and jungles beyond recognition; also that sea and land communication systems had not yet completely broken down.

This is not surprising. We know from the Travels of Buddhagupta (late 16th and early 17th century A.D.), a famous Buddhist ecclesiastic of Tibet hailing from Vijayanagara who was the teacher of the equally famous Tārānātha of Bengal and Tibet, that Buddhist monastic establishments continued to flourish in different parts of India (and adjacent Insulindia from East Africa to Indo-China) as late as the time of Akbar and Jahangir. We also know that, even after the days of Tārānātha and Sum. pa. Mkhan. po., in the days of Hastings and Cornwallis, there were Bengal Buddhist monks, like Pūrṇa-Giri of Joshi-Maṭh, who were in touch with the E. I. Company, Nepal, Tibet and China, acting as agents of the Company, and that there was a Buddhist Monastery almost opposite Fort William (the Bhoṭa-Vihāra, near Śivpur), well endowed by Tibetan and Chinese gifts. It would seem as if Buddhist sites and establishments decayed finally (along with many 'Hindu' ones) in the time of Shah Jahan and Aurangzeb, and

what remained perished in the disorders and destructions filling the whole of the 18th century history.

Sum. pa. Mkhan. po.'s account is here given in *strictly literal* and therefore somewhat awkward English translation, with comments on points of interest.

TIBETAN TEXT

Thog. mar. Rgya. gar. gyi. dgon. pa. sa. chu. groñ. khyer. sogs. gañ. dañ. gañ. du. yod. pa. śes. na. bstan. pa. bstan. *ahjin*. gañ. du. byuñ. va. śes. sla. bas. rags. cam. smos. na. |

| *Ahjam*. gliñ. gi. yul. spyi-*ahi*. gnas. *chul*. ni. |

Ri. rab. phyogs. kyi. Byañ. mthaah. *Ahjam*. bu-*ahi*. ljon. pa. nas. Lho-*ahi*. Rgya. mcho-*ahi*. bar. du. rim. par. chu. mig. stoñ. gi. chu. sde. dañ. | Śam. bha. la. dañ. | coñ. la. riñ. mo. dañ. gañs. Ti. se. Mcho. Ma. dros. pa. dañ. Bal. yul. dañ. | Rgya. gar. dañ. | Ri. vo. *Ahbig*s. byed. dañ. Rgya. mchor. Dha. na. Śrī-*ahi*. gliñ. phran. dañ. Dpal. gyi. rir. *Ahbras*. Spuñs. dañ. Ri. Po. ta. la. yod. | Rgya. gar. spyir. *Ahjam*.. gliñ. *ahdi-ahi*. lho. na. yod. kyañ. ston. pas. chos. gsuñs. te. thub. bstan. thog. mar. dar. bas. chos. kyi. dvañ. du. btañ. nas. Dbus. su. bshag. pa-*ahi*. Śar. du. Li. *Ahjañ* dañ. Rgya. nag. Che. Chuñ. dañ. |

Nub. tu. O. rgyan. O.ñi. ya. na. sur. chag. dañ. | Byañ. Śar. du. Bod. dañ. Hor. yul. chen. po. dañ. | Gu. gsum. | Nub. Byañ du. Lcags. Sgo. riñ. mo. dañ. Bu. mo. gyon. ru-*ahi*. yul. sogs. dañ. | Śar. Lho. nas. Nub. kyi. bar. gyi. Rga. mchor. Gliñ. phran. rnañs. dañ. | Nub. Byañ. nas. Byañ. Śar. bar. gyi. rgyab. mthar. Tho. kar. Ta. si ka. Tu. ruk. śa. Sog. po. Ho. thon. O. ro. su. sogs. mthaah. *ahkhob*. pa. loñs. spyod. ldan. pas. bskor. va. yod. do. ||

Khyad. par. Rgya. gar. du. Ti. se. nas. byuñ. va-*ahi*. chu. kluñ. chen. po. Gañgā-*ahi*. Byañ. na. chu. vo. Ya. mu. nā. dañ. | Nai. rañ. ja. ni. Gañgā. la. Ma. ga. dha. nas. *ahdres*. te. | de-*ahi*. Śar. brgyud. de. Śar. Lho-*ahi*. dañ. Si. tā-*ahi*. mjug. Lo. hi. ti-*ahi*. mjug. Pakṣu. dañ. *ahdres*. nas. | Nub. kyi. dañ. Sin. dhu. Lho. Nub. kyi. Rga. mchor. *ahbab*. ser. la. | yañ. Gnās. ñer. bshi-*ahi*. nañ. chan. gyi. Ti. śa. ku. ni. shes. pa. Gañgā. Sin. dhu. gsum. *ahdus*. la. bśad. pa-*ahñ*. snañ. | Śar. ñe. *ahog*. tu. Bya. gag. gi. Kun. dgaah. ra. va. | Byañ. du. Gar. mkhan. mchog. || Śar. du-*ahñ*. Na. len. dra. || Lhor. Koñ. ku-*ahi*. bye. brag. Kāñcī-r. rgyal. dvañ. gcug. nor. Chos. grags. kyi. yin. | Nub. Byañ. Bcom. rlag. tu. *Ahdam*. bu. can. gyi. lha. khañ. yod. | Chos. grags. kyi. gnās. gcig. ni. Tam. bu. la. Lho. || Sañs. bskyañs. kyi. Lho-*ahi*. so. Sor. raṣ. ta. | Dbus. Ma. ga. dha-*ahi*. char. gtogs. su. Rdo. rje. gdan. Nā. len. dra. O. tan. ta. pu. ri. Vi. kra. ma. la. śī. la. sogs. dgon. chen. rnañs. dañ.

Ahdul. va. Me. tog. phren. rgyud. las. | “Mñan. yod. Gnas. bcas. Cam. pa. ka. | Va. ra. na. si. Yañs. pa. can. | Rgyal. po-ahi. khab. ni. drug. pa. ste. | De. dag. groñ. khyer. chen. po. grags.” | Shes. pa. ltar. gyi. groñ. khyer. dañ. | Byañ. phyogs. Tha. ru-ahi. brgyud. Dho. lan. Rba. ra. ha. ra. tra. sogs. dañ. | Śar. Dbus. mchams. su. Li. kha. ra. śiñ. ahphel. dañ. | Śar. la. gsum. las. Bāñ. ga. la. dañ. Ti. ra. hū. ti. dañ. O. di. bi. śa. sogs. Śar. phyogs. Ñi. ahog. pa. dañ. | De-ahi. Byañ. du. Bañ. ga. la. dañ. ñe. bar. Ka. ma. ru. dañ. Go. ḍa. dañ. Ti. spu. ra. dañ. Ha. nu. ma. sogs. la. spyi. miñ. Gi. ri. va. dha. ser. va. dañ. | De. dag. gi. Śar. mtha-ahi. dañ. Spu. kham. dañ. Pa. la. ku. sogs. la. Ra. khañ. dañ. Hi. sa. va. ti. dañ. Mar. go. sogs. la. Mu. ñan. dañ. gshan. yañ. Cak. ma. dañ. Kam. po. ca. sogs. de. thams. cad. kyī. spyi. miñ. Ko. ki. ser. || Dbus. dañ. Lho-ahi. bar. du. Ahbar. ba-ahi. phug. dañ. || Rgya. mchor. ñe. va. Lhor. Ka. ṇa. ṭa. dañ. Vidyā. nā. ga. ra. dañ. Koñ. Ku. na. dañ. Tu. mu. ra. ti. dañ. Dra. pa. li. dañ. Mā. lya. ra. dañ. Ti. liñ. ka-ahi. char. gtogs. Ka. liñ. ka. dañ. Kha. gan. sogs. yod. la. | Lho. phyogs. ahdi-ahi. dbyibs. gru. gsum. du. yod.-pa-ahi. rce. mo. Rgya. mchor. sug. par. Ra. smi. śva. iī. yod. ciñ. rce. mo. de-ahi. Śar. phyogs. kyī. Rgya. mcho. la. Ma. he. da. rdi. dañ. Nub. kyī. Mcho. la. Ra. ta. nā. gi. ri. ser. la. ||
| Rgyal. bstan. de-ahi. bar. du. dar. va. ni. |
Ahjam. dpal. rca. brgyud. las. | “Sa. ni. rgya. mcho. gñis. mthar. thug. | ces. pas. luñ. bstan. to.” ||
Dbus. kyī. Va. ra. ṇa. si. nas. Nub. tu. Pra. yā. ka. dañ. Bcom. rlag. dañ. Ku. ra. dañ. Lña. len. dañ. A. ga. ra. dañ. Sa. ga. ri. dañ. Di. li. dañ. Mā. la. va. dañ. | gshan. yañ. Ma. ru. Di. li. Ha. la. Kaccha. sogs. yod. de. ||
Ahdi. dag. Lo. ccha. sogs. kyī. dag. pa. gros. ltar. bris. pa. yin. shin ||

LITERAL ENGLISH TRANSLATION

Of Ancient India the monasteries, provinces, rivers and towns, etc., wheresoever they were situated, if one wants to know,—Doctrines and Doctors wherever they flourished, if one wants to remember and learn easily,—(then here is given).

• ABOUT JAMBŪ-DVĪPA THE GENERAL INFORMATION :

In the direction of Sumeru in the Northern Border, from its Jambū forests,¹ down to the Ocean of the South, (there are) in a series

1. I.e., the Jambū-tree forests of Jambū-dvīpa are in its northern borderland, and beyond that is the Sumeru Range.

thousands of springs and groups (systems) of rivers. On the one hand (lie) Śam. bha. la.,² and high precipitous long-winding (mountain) passes,³ the Snowy Mount Kailāsa,⁴ and the Lake Anavatapta,⁵ and Nepāl⁶; on the other (the wide plains of) India⁷.—The Vindhya mountains⁸, and in the Ocean the small island of Dhana-śrī⁹; and by the Śrī-Parvata, Dhānya-Kaṭaka¹⁰; and the Mount Potala."¹¹—India on the

2. In Tibetan works Śam. bha. la. always stands for Bāhlika (Balkh or Bactria), between the Jambū (Amū, Oxus) and the Hindu Kush.

3. These would be the Khawak, Kaoshan and other lofty passes (c. 13,000 ft.) in the Hindu Kush, crossed by Alexander's armies.

4. 'Ti. se'.

5. 'Mcho. Ma. dros. pa.'; i.e., Mānasa-sarovara (Māna-sarovara or Māna-saras, vern. Man-sarovar or Mān-sar); probably this is a bilingualism, as Tib. 'Mañ'=Lake; cf. 'Mañ. yul.', the Lake-land, the regions of Mansarovar Lake and the head-waters of the Indus, Sutlej and other rivers (vide, no. 21).

6. 'Bal. yul.', lit.= 'Wool-land'. It would appear that the other name of this region, 'Nepāl' (and the name of its people, 'Nevār') is really a Tibetan name, 'Gnas. bal.' = Land of Wool = 'Bal. yul.'; one name was used mostly in Trans-Himalayas, the other in Cis-Himalayas.

7. 'Rgya. gar.', more correctly 'Rgya. dkar.' = 'Wide or Great White', probably standing for an Indian name like 'Mahā-Gauḍ(r)a'. 'Rgya' by itself is also used for the Indian Plains, and there stands for 'Mahī', 'Urvī' or 'Pṛthvī', traditional geographical names for the Gangetic Plains or Bhārata. Later Tibetan commentators explain 'dkar' as referring to the white dress and turbans of Indians, but that seems far-fetched and unreal.

8. 'Ri. wo. Ahbigs. byed'.

9. 'Dhana-śrī' in the text. Some Tibetans identify it with Amarāvati (in which case 'the small island' of the text refers to the delta of the Kṛṣṇā or the Godāvarī, called in Tamil 'Ilam-Kai' = 'small land' or islet, all deltas as well as islands generally being so called in Tamil). Others take it to be Ceylon which came to be so called owing to its effulgent riches (in which case the riches refers to the island being Kuvera's land according to the Epic, and 'the small island' of the text refers to the standard name of 'Laṅkā', a Sanskritisation of the same 'Ilam-Kai.' But it may be noted that in one passage of the Dpag. bsam. ljoñ. bsañ. the islands of 'Dhanaśrī' and of 'Sinhala' are mentioned side by side in the same sentence as separate.

10. This is usually taken to be in the lower Kṛṣṇā and Godāvarī region, along with Nāgārjunī-Koṇḍa and Amarāvati; but there was another Dhānya-kaṭaka near the Puṣpagiri and Udayagiri ruins (the site of the ancient Puṣpagiri-vihāra) in South Orissa. Cuttack (Kaṭaka) also claims to be another site of that name. The Dhānya-Kaṭaka of the text is qualified by proximity to a Hill (Śrī-parvata, a rather common name).

whole in this Jambū-dvīpa though to the South lies, (and though) the Great Teacher preached the Buddhist Doctrine in ancient times (only here), (yet) under the influence of his Dharma, Missions¹² were sent to and established in Central Tibet¹³, and to the East in Li.¹⁴, *Ahjañ*.¹⁵ and China¹⁶, both Greater and Lesser¹⁷.—To the West (of India), O. rgyan., or O.ḍi. ya. na. in corrupt form ;¹⁸ towards the North-East,

11. There are two Tibetan interpretations: One Potala is a harbour on the Indian Ocean; the other Potala is also a harbour, but on the China Sea, not far from Shanghai,—apparently a colony from Eastern India in the extreme limits of Indo-China or in the island of Formosa. Some European scholars equate Potala with Alexander's Pātāla in Sindh (philologically unsuitable), but the two Potalas known to Tibetan sources are Mounts, i.e. harbours in mountainous coast-line, and the Potala of Indian Ocean is also close to Dhānyakataka, and is evidently a harbour [like Vizagapatam, Viśākhāpattana] under the Eastern Ghats spurs jutting out into the Sea.

12. Or, 'under his influence Dharma Missions were sent,' etc..

13. Lit. 'the Middle Country.' The Tibetans used the analogy of India's 'madhyadeśa' in their home geography also.

14. 'Li.' ordinarily denotes Kashgar and Khotan, also called 'Kaṁsa-deśa' (Li.=bell-metal=Kaṁsa); but that is to the W. of Central Tibet, and does not suit here. But a district of East Tibet on Chinese border is also called 'Li.'

15. '*Ahjañ*.' is ordinarily='Kham' in W. Tibet; but this does not suit here; curiously, there is another 'Kham' region in East Tibet.

16. 'Rgya. nag.' = Great Black = Mahākāla; Tibetans commonly say that China was so called owing to the black dress and headgear of the people; but it seems better to take it as a translation of a lost Indian geographical name 'Mahākāla' (or equivalent),—or to take it as corrupt from *either* 'Rgya. nags.' = Great Forest, 'Mahāvana', 'Mahā-Kāntāra', or 'Rgya. na. ga.' = Great Pasture-land (or Meadows, Fields), 'Mahā-vraja' (M°-Vṛji or M°-Vajji) or Mahā-Kṣetra.

17. This refers to Cina proper and Mahā-Cina or Mongolia, Manchuria, etc..

18. That is, corrupt form of 'Udyāna'; Tibetan writers therefore were aware of older classical names and later 'apabhraṁśa' forms thereof. 'O. rgyan.' = 'U. rgyan.' = Head-Ornament; 'Udyāna' was therefore derived by Tibetans as 'Ud-dyāna' from √dyū, to shine bright, giving the meaning of a diadem on the head; alternatively, they may have taken 'dyāna' of 'Ud-dyāna' as = 'dyūta', from the same √dyū = to delight, to play, and taken 'Ud-dyāna' to mean 'Top Dice', since 'rgyan.' also means 'dice.'

Bod.¹⁹, and the great country of Hor.²⁰; and "the three 'Gu's.'"²¹ To the North-West, the long-winding 'Iron Gates',²² and Kas. mi. ri.²³; and 'Bu. mo. gyon. ru-ahi. Yul.', etc.²⁴.—From the South-East to the limits of the West²⁵, (there are) small islands (or Archipelago) in the (Indian) Ocean. From the North-West to the limits of the North-

19. 'Bod.' = Tibet = Tibbat or Ti. bod. = Bsti. bod. = Bod which contains 'bsti' = the Lama's residence, or Vihāras and Ārāmas; Tib. 'bsti' has the same sense as Sans. 'vasati' or 'ā-vasatha' (vern. 'basti'). 'Bod.' as a geographical name is perhaps connected with 'Budha' of the Purāṇic legends and with the Purāṇic regional name of 'Ilā-vṛta Varṣa', the country of Budha.

20. The Tibetan name for Tartary or Mongolia; it may be compared with Purāṇic 'Hari-Varṣa.'

21. I.e., 'the 3 hill-girt districts or circles', the same as 'Mña. ri. ahkhor. gsum.', assigned to princes of the Tibetan royal families in the past; these three are: 'Gu. ge.' (= Rocky) or 'Shañ. shuñ.', 'Spu. rañs.' (Snowy,—lit. 'Roma-harṣaṇa'), and 'Mañ. yul.' (= Lake-land),—which last includes the Mānasa lakes and the sources of Indus, Sutlej and other rivers, and which Mānasa region was the birthplace of the pre-Buddhistic 'Bon' religion, founded by Gśen. rabs., the noblest of the 'Gśen', a branch of the Śākyas or Ikṣvākus (from amongst whom its supplanter, Buddhism, also arose); 'Bon' is der. from √bon. pa., to mutter mantras or recite psalms; cf. the Ind. root 'bhañ', to recite or chant, and the 'Bhāṇakas' or 'Bhāṇas' of sacred texts known to Buddhist literature and Inscriptions (Bharhut, etc.); 'bhañ' is also used of medieval religious poetry, e.g. in Vidyāpati of Mithilā.

22. These are the famous Iron Gates Passes in the Caspian region known to the Greek geographers.

23. Kāśmīra, clearly; but as it is in the Text, it means 'the Kas. mi. Hills'; probably the 'ra' of the Indian form represents 'ri' of the Tibetan, and the racial name of the men of these hill tracts was Kas or Kaś, the full phrase meaning 'the Hills of the Kas people or race'; these men would be either Khasas or 'Kassi' (or 'Kāśyapas' in Sanskritised form).

24. Lit. 'the land of the woman's (or virgin's) left horn' or 'the lāṇḍ of Vāmā(a)-śṛṅga', probably in Nārī-khaṇḍa (vern. Nārkaṇḍa) or Strī-rājya. This is apparently the region referred to in the Mahābhārata where the Pāṇḍavas were born. The Harivaṁśa knows of a people called 'Vāma-cūḍa's. The name Vāma-śṛṅga or Vāma-cūḍa may have originated from the 'horn headgear' of the hillmen of the Western Himalayas near about Simla Hill States and Rampur-Bashahr (in which region Nārkaṇḍa or Nārī-khaṇḍa is situated), specially of their women and brides,—and the name Strī-rājya or Nārī-khaṇḍa from the still surviving polyandric and matriarchal character of their society.

25. Since these limits refer to the Indian Ocean, therefore these islands of the South-East must mean the East Indies, and those of the West limits the

East,²⁶ and beyond that limit,²⁷ Thod. dkar.,²⁸ Ta. si. ka.,²⁹ Tu. ruk. sa.,³⁰ Sog. po.,³¹ Ho. thon.,³² O. ro. su.,³³ and other border regions, are full of rich and prosperous people.³⁴

islands of Socotra, Zanzibar, Reunion and Mauritius, and the Seychelles group, if not Madagascar; but if East Indies can be called 'small islands', Madagascar need not be excluded; besides the Tib. phrase 'small islands' can also be translated 'small lands' = islands. This description perhaps indicates that from East Africa to East Indies all the islands were regarded in the days of medieval Tibetan writers as belonging to India; Cf. Buddhagupta's East African and East Indies travels.

26. These limits refer to the N. W. and N. E. boundaries of Jambū-dvīpa (from Oxus to Brahmaputra).

27. I.e., behind the first belt of adjacent countries there are other regions also known.

28. The text has 'Tho. kar.' wrongly. Thod. dkar = White Head or Turban; Hiuen-Tsang mentions this; probably it represents 'Śveta-dvīpa' of Purāṇic geography.

29. Also written in Tib. as 'Stag. gsig.' = tiger-leopard or 'Citra-Vyāghra.' Tibetans used this name (=Tājik) for Persia and adjacent western countries like Arabia.

30. The land of the Turks; either Manchuria, or Turkey (in Asia and in Europe) may be intended,—the former if the author is repeating ancient geography, the latter if he is adding early 18th century knowledge. Western and Eastern 'Turkestans' of modern geography are *not* intended, as these are covered in the text by 'Sog. po.' and 'Ho. thon.'

31.. Also called 'Sog.' (=Śaka); apparently Śakadvīpa or Sogdiana; often regarded in Tibet as equivalent to or neighbouring 'Hor.' (*vide ante*), 'Maga' or 'Makha' (=Mongol) countries.

32. Same as 'Kho. tan.' or 'Gu. tan.' corrupt from 'Gu. brtan.' = wide region, or permanent fixed abode. Probably this represents the 'Dhruva-loka' of Purāṇic geography. It is curious to reflect that a stepmother's persecution drove Aśoka's son Kuṇāla to find a quiet kingdom in the same Khotan where ages ago another stepmother queen impelled Uttānapāda's son Dhruva to seek refuge; it shows that Khotan is a part of India traditionally, an outpost receiving periodical settlements.

33. Tibetan form of Russia. It is possible that the Russ or Russi people were immediate North-Western Asiatic neighbours of Tibetans in the middle ages, kindred to the 'Sog.' or the 'Hor.'. In this connection I may point out that there is a fair sprinkling of Lithuanian and Slavonic roots among Tibetan ones.

34. This description of prosperity would hold good of Persia, Turkey,

In detail,—Towards India (flows) from Kailāsa originating,³⁵ the great deep river Gaṅgā, and by its North³⁶ the river Yamunā. The Nairāñjanī into the Gaṅgā from Magadha joins³⁷; of that (junction)³⁸ going *via* the East and also the South-East, the Sitā³⁹ (flows) beyond, beyond that the Lohitī³⁹, and beyond that the Pakṣu³⁹,—(all) joining

Samarkand, Khotan (within China) and Russia (Asiatic as well), in the first quarter or half of the 18th century when Sum. pa. Mkhan. po. compiled this account. The word for 'border' may also be translated as 'pagan,' 'non-Buddhistic,' or 'barbarian.'

35. Tibetans should be credited with knowing something about Upper and Trans-Himalayan geography; when they say the Ganges originates in Kailāsa, they probably mean that the cluster of snow-clad peaks and the glaciers fed from them which form the sources of the Ganges, form part of the Kailāsa mountain range or system.

36. I.e., towards the sources; the lower courses being different.

37. It is to be noted that from the medieval monk pilgrim's point of view, after Yamunā the next important tributaries of the Gaṅgā are given as Nairāñjanī, Sitā, Lohitī and Pakṣu, and others are omitted; i.e. Mathurā, Kauśāmbī, Magadha and Bāṅgāla regions are contemplated pre-eminently.

38. This junction would be at Pāṭaliputra, to its East, where the Pun-pun at present falls into the Ganges; the Pun-pun represents the old joint bed of the Nairāñjanī (Phalgū) and the Soṇa.

39. The direction, going down the Ganges East and then South East, indicates that these 3 rivers flowing into the Ganges belong to the Bengal river system, and this is confirmed by the inclusion of the Lohitī or Brahmaputra, which in earlier times fell into the Ganges much lower down than at present (near Tripurā district). I accordingly take the Sitā (the White River,—cf. the Red River Lohitī) to be the same as the river Dhavalā, Dhavala-śrī [or Dhaleśv(śś)arī in corrupt form], which flows into the Ganges below Dacca. [It should be noted that this town is on the Buṛī-Gaṅgā, the ancient bed of the Ganges]. The other river Pakṣu therefore has to be sought amongst the Lakṣā, Meghnā or Surmā (which is the upper stream of the Meghnā). Pakṣu may be a short form of Kāka-pakṣa or raven-black, referring to the dark waters of either the Meghnā [=Megha-ghanā, Cloud-dark] or the Lakṣā (also called Sital-lakṣā, prob. corr. for Asitalakṣā, Black-looking or Dark-Beauty),—both in marked contrast (at the junctions) with the creamy waters of the Dhaleśvarī or the Padmā (Gaṅgā). These East Bengal rivers are particularly mentioned in the Tibetan Buddhist account next to the Nairāñjanī (by Vajrāsana and Pāṭali), because the famous Buddhist centre of Suvarṇagrāma (Sonārgaon), which flourished under the Candra Dynasty, was situated in this region, and other centres like Ca. ṭi. ga. ma [Śāṭi-grāma or Śaṣṭi-grāma, 60-villages (cf. Saptagrāma), or the Settlement of the goddess Śaṣṭī]

(the Gaṅgā) together.—In the (direction of the) West, the Sindhu⁴⁰ into the South-Western Sea flows, *it is said ; on the other hand*, within the area of 'the 24-Districts'⁴¹, at Ti. śa. ku. ni.⁴² by name, Gaṅgā and

or Ṣaṭ-Kṛttikā,—mod. Chittagong], also a Candra capital, and Na. len. dra. of the East (distinct from 'Nālanda,' probably in Dacca district), were to be reached through this region,—as also the Buddhist kingdoms further to the East (vide *infra.*). Cf. 'the Blue River' along which the traffic flowed from Lakhnauti to the capital of Baṅgāla in the days of Ibn Batuta (Gibbs' Trans., 271), which obviously refers to the dark Meghnā or Pakṣu [The capital must have been either Sonārgāon or Chittagong].—Pakṣu or Vakṣu, apart from being a name for the Jambū or Oxus river, is also known to lexicons to be the name of a tributary of the Ganges. Lohitī is still the form prevalent in Assam (not Lauhitya).

40. From what follows it is clear that our author is taking Sindhu to be the same as Sarasvatī; he is correct in a sense, since in Vedic literature the two names are sometimes used of the same river. He is referring to the well-known controversy about the course of the ancient Sarasvatī; the earliest geographical and religious tradition is that G.° and S.° converge at Prayāga (Yukta-veṇī) and separate again at Triveṇī (Mukta-veṇī) before reaching the sea; later on in historical times the Sarasvatī changed its course owing to raising of the surface between the Y.° and the S.°, and joined the Indus system; still later, owing to further geographical changes, its bed became dry from 'Vinaśana' onwards. Our author prefers the orthodox paṇḍits' point of view ['it is said' *versus* 'it is explained by sages'], and includes the Triveṇī of the South in his guide book.

41. 'Gnas. ñer. bshi.', '24-regions, or districts, or subdivisions'; evidently the district of '24-Parganās' is meant, for 'the Triveṇī' is said to be within its area, and it is generally Lower Bengal that is being referred to in the text here. The question arises whether the regional name of '24-Parganas' had come to be used in the time of the Lo. ca. wa. s (900-1300 A.D.) from whom our author has compiled this account,—or even in his own time (1722-'47). It is not impossible, since the capital city of Baṅgāla, Cāṭīgrāma, was known as such to both the early Muslim and European writers as also to the Tibetan works of the middle ages. It is known that at the time when the East India Company was acquiring zemindary rights of a number of villages in Lower Bengal, the area known as 24-Parganas was there; so Sum. pa. Mkhan. po's reference to it at a slightly earlier date (c. 1722) is quite possible. But he is all along following the early medieval Indian tradition in his descriptions, and assumes that medieval place names and sacred sites still exist in his time more or less intact, so as to be readily recognisable by contemporary Tibetan pilgrims of the early 18th century. It is therefore probable that the name '24-Parganas,' i.e. '24-Pragaṇas' (24 circles of 100 gaṇas or village-communes) came down to us from at least the Gupta

Sindhu, these three⁴³, are mixed together, (*thus*) it is explained by sages⁴⁴ To the East (of this place) near below⁴⁵ is the Karaṇḍārāma.⁴⁶

period when 'gaṇas' still existed, through the Pāla period (characterised by democratic features). Bengal was a stronghold of 'gaṇa'-tantra, as is shown by the reference to the Sam-Vaṅgīyas in the Mahasthan Māuryan inscription and to their federal capital at Puṇḍravardhana; that is why kings were sometimes elected here; village communities of the Prācī were 'gaṇas', and a natural administrative institution would be the 'Pragaṇa', in later vernacular 'Perganah.' Sher Shah was a 'national' King in the sense that in his revenue reforms (as in other measures) he hailed back to the early Hindu traditions and made the 'Pragaṇa' the basis of his revenue divisions.

42. Elsewhere in his work (towards the beginning) our author mentions this place in a more correct form, 'Tri. śa. ku. ni.', and explains this by the qualification 'gsum. ahdus.' = '3-saṅgama' or '3 rivers in one', i.e., 'Trivenī'. 'Triśakuni' lit. means 'three birds,' evidently referring to the 3 swift-flowing rivers coursing through the wide expanse of the alluvial plains like birds through the sky; the metaphor is true Vedic, and we are reminded of Vedic rivers described as 'suparṇā'. Just as 'venī' (not so much 'plaits of hair' as 'lovers', or 'wooers', i.e. of the Sea, 'Apām Napāt': cf. Vedic description of the 3 rivers, G.°, Y.° and S.° as lovers of Apām Napāt) designates the river swiftly rushing forth, so also does 'śakuni' (cf. 'suparṇā'); the synonym 'vihagā' (bird, flowing through wide expanse) has also the same sense of swift-flowing river. It is interesting to note that the 'Trivenī-saṅgama' referred to by our author here still exists as a place of pilgrimage, and the railway station for it is called 'Triśa-bighā,' a curious 'apabhraṃśa' and relic of both 'Triśakuni' and 'Tri-vihagā' (both meaning 3-birds or 3-rivers or Trivenī). The old bed of the silted up Sarasvatī is still discernible in this region; and near by is the site of the famous medieval Saptagrāma. The present district of 24-Parganas is wholly to the east of the Bhāgīrathī, but in earlier times village groups to the West of the river, including the site of Trivenī might easily have been reckoned within its area, as our author says it was.

43. The writer has missed the 3rd name, the branch river that would correspond with the Yamunā. The Sindhu he takes to be the Sarasvatī; this is clear from the two geographical traditions he refers to; also the equation of Sindhu and Sarasvatī is Vedic.

44. Or,—thus it is discovered (or concluded) by the wise.

45. Probably this means 'lower down the course of the Gaṅgā, following its eastern branch or the Padmā (not the southern branch).'

46. 'Bya. gag.' can be translated as 'Karaṇḍa,' 'Kokila,' or 'Sārikā'; so alternative names would be 'Kokilārāma' and 'Sārikārāma.' 'Karaṇḍa,' again, may mean 'the Bee-hive,' a fine description of a Vihāra, or 'duck', which latter is accepted by our writer (bya. gag.); if he is correct, the Duck-Vihāra must have

To the North (of this) is Naṭavara.⁴⁷ To the East (of it) is Nalendra.⁴⁸ —In the South (of India) flourished the Vaiśeṣika (philosopher) of Koṇ. ku.⁴⁹ at Kāñcī, Dharma-kīrti (ācārya), the 'jinendra-śiromaṇi'.⁵⁰ To the North-West, in Mathurā,⁵¹ the temple of Śarāvati⁵² was. Of Dharma-kīrti one of the monasteries is Dakṣiṇa-Tambula. To the Southern border of Buddha-gupta is Sor. raṣ. ṭa.⁵³ In the Middle

been beside some Bengal 'jhil' or 'bil' abounding in ducks. Karaṇḍa-vihāra is often referred to in Buddhist texts, and Tibetans always place it in Bengal. Elsewhere our author says that this Vihāra in Bāṅgālā was built for and presented to, Arhat Yaśa-Indrasena (disciple of Arhat Ripuñjaya Guru of Prācya and later on the converter of Kālāśoka) by Mahendra a great-grandson of Darśaka,—which would be cir. 492–483 B.C., acc. to our author's chronology.

47. Elsewhere in the same work, 'Naṭavara-pura' [not 'Naṭa(-vara or vīra)-Vihāra', which according to the same authority was near Mathurā]; said to be the same as present Natore (in N. Bengal),—to the north of the Padmā River and not far from Puṇḍravardhana (Mahasthan) and Paharpur. Natore area should be archæologically explored.

48. This Nalendra-Vihāra, to the East of Natore and beyond the Ganges, is to be distinguished from its namesake in South Bihar, otherwise known as 'Nālanda' (and various other forms). It was this Eastern 'Nālanda' [really 'Narendra-vihāra' or 'the King's Monastery'] that King Gopāla is said to have founded in the Tibetan sources, for the other Nālanda existed long before. It is likely that, a good deal of what is said about Nālanda of South Bihar [the origin of the name being different] really belongs to this 'Bāṅgālā' Nālanda. Its name perhaps survives in the 'Nārindā' ward of the City of Dacca [Davāka] on the Buṛī-Gaṅgā or the ancient flow of the Ganges; excavations might repay.

49. Same as 'Koṅgu,' known to Ind. lit. and inscr. Dharmakīrti was thus a man of 'Koṅgu-deśa' and he worked at Kāñcīpuram mainly; his 'guru' Dharmapāla was also a Southerner; 'Dakṣiṇa-Tambula' was one of the Vihāras founded by him, as noted *infra*.

50. In Tibetan references Buddhist saints, scholars, etc., are often called 'Jina' (and deriv.); this is probably due to influence of Bengal (whencefrom Tibetan Buddhism largely emanated), where Jainism long existed side by side with Buddhism, and even flourished for some time.

51. The Tib. name lit. means 'conquered and destroyed,' i.e. by Yavanas as they say [Greeks, Śakas, or Muslims.]

52. The text has 'Ahdam. spu.', wrong for 'Ahdam. bu.'. Śarāvati is very well known to Tibetan Buddhist tradition, and numerous episodes in Church history are connected with it.

53. This seems to mean that "in the Southern border of Śurāṣṭra is situated a 'vihāra' associated with the name of Buddha-gupta (or °-pālita)"; which Bud-

Country, in regions included within Magadha⁵⁴, are Vajrāsana, Nālen-dra, Otanta-purī, Vikrama-śīla,⁵⁵ and various other big Monasteries.

From the 'Vinaya-puṣpa-mālikā-Tantra':— "Śrāvastī, Sāketana, Campaka, Vārāṇasī, Vaiśālī, Rājagṛha,—these 6,—they are the famous big cities."—But like them there are other (big) cities :—To the North, going by way of Tha. ru., Dho. lan.,⁵⁶ Rba. ra. ha. ra. tra.,⁵⁷ etc.. To the East of the limits of the Middle Country,⁵⁸ Puṇḍra-vardhana.⁵⁹

dhagupta and which 'vihāra' is not noted in the text ; possibly Tārānātha's teacher Buddhagupta is referred to.

54. It is to be noted that in Tibetan Buddhist geography Magadha is *not* within Prācī, but within Madhyadeśa, whereas the whole country from Tirabhukti (as much western as Magadha) to Kāmarūpa and Oḍiviśa (Orissa) to Caṭigāma (Chittagong) is stated as forming the Prācī, Vāṅgālā being almost equivalent to Prācī,—which shows extension of the name Vāṅgālā.

55. It is to be noted that Vikramaśīla is stated to be "in a region *included* within Magadha ;" this region is clearly Aṅga.

56. 'Tha. ru.' and 'Dho. lan.' are apparently unidentifiable towns, unless we take 'Tha. ru.' to be a Tib. trans. of 'Aja-mi(ī)ra' (Ajmer), which in Sans. means 'Goat-limit,' and Dholan to be a corr. from of 'Dhaura,' a tīrtha (cf. also N. W. place names like Dhūlan or Dhūliān).—It is however possible to translate—"going *by means of* 'Tha. ru. Dho. lan.'," in which case 'Tharu Dholan' can be taken to be a form of the Sanskrit 'Taru (-°ṭṛ, -°tra) Dhorāṇa', i.e. swift horse chariot or horse post, going at a quick trot ; this kind of conveyance would therefore seem to be in common use on cross country routes in medieval times, specially in North India.

57. Seems to be corrupt for 'Varāha-kṣetra' or 'Puṣkara,' near Ajmer (vide n. 56).

58. I.e., in the Prācī, of which Bāṅgālā is the centre ; note the next sentence. It is clear that the cultural and linguistic affinity of Mithilā, Utkala and Bāṅgālā was already well established and recognised in the days when Tibetan Buddhistic traditions became fixed, i.e. in the Pāla period (750-1200). It is also to be noted that Kāmarūpa, Gauḍa, Tripura, and the Hill-country adjacent, are regarded as within the sphere of affinity of the Prācī peoples.—I am inclined to think that this pushing of the Prācī sphere to the East beyond Magadha, so as to exclude it and Kāśī-Kośala, while including Mithilā (rather out of the way), and so as to include the regions up to the Eastern Hills, is due to the denationalisation of the ancient Magadha by successive Yavana, Śaka, Andhra and Hūna occupations and devastation (last but not the least by the events of the early 13th century),—as a result of which the best elements of ancient Magadhan population and culture began to migrate into the Bengal provinces from the 2nd century B.C. onwards, and found a very kindred receptive and congenial atmosphere for continued life and progress. Ultimately even from

Of the three (regions) in the East, Bāñ. ga. la. and Ti. ra. hū. ti. and O.ḍi. bi. śa.⁶⁰ by name (or etc.), is composed the Prācī.⁵⁸ Of these, to the North of Bāñ. ga. la., and near by,⁵⁸ Ka. ma. ru., and Go. ḍa., and Ti. spu. ra.⁶¹, Ha. nu. ma.⁶², etc.; and also (the country) generally known as Gi. ri. wa. dha.⁶³ by name. And to the Eastern limits of them, Spu. kham., Pa. la. ku.⁶⁴, etc. ; and Ra. khañ.⁶⁵ and Hi. sa. wa.

these regions the culture and best elements of the surviving people were expelled into Greater India, across the Himalayas into Nepal and Tibet, or across the Eastern Hills into Further India, or across the Seas into East Indies and Indo-China,—as indeed the Tibetan Church histories indicate by specific references.

59. The city of 'Li. Kha (ka). ra.—śiñ.', i.e. of the Līkara plant or Sweet Cane or Sugar Cane (cf. Lat. Liquorice = the Sweet Stick, 'yaṣṭhi-madhūka'); prob. the form in the mind of our author is not Puṇḍravardhana, but Puṇḍra-nagara. In Buddhistic times this region and town was known to Tibet as the best sugar producing and manufacturing centre of India ; cf. 'Gauḍa' as producing 'guḍa' or 'powder-sugar,' i.e. 'bhurā.' 'Puṇḍra' = 'Ikṣu' or sugarcane. The lexicons give Puṇḍra as the name of the red variety of sugarcane, also called 'Puṇḍrekṣu' or 'Puṇḍarika' (= 'Puṇḍrika'). 'Puṇḍarika-pura' was a town with a 'māhātmya,' and Hemacandra (Parīśiṣṭa°) knows of a town near Vidhya called 'Puṇḍarikiṇī.' It seems possible that the 'Puṇḍrakas' (mod. Pods) of Bengal were of the same stock as the 'Ikṣvākas' (since Puṇḍra=Ikṣu). In the early days of the European Companies' trade also, Bengal was the best sugar-manufacturing region of India.

60. 'O. ḡi. vi. śa.' stands either for Oḍra-viṣaya or Oḍra-viśa (the Land of the Oḍra Viś or tribe); it is also the early medieval original of the modern 'renaissance' form Oḍiśā (corrupted by Sanskritists into Uḍiṣyā and Anglicists into Orissa).

61. I.e., Kāma-rūpa, Gauḍa, Tripura (°ā, Tippera); the context shows that both towns and districts of the same name are referred to.

62. Supposed to be Hill Tracts of Tippera and adjacent hilly regions of Surmā Valley. 'Hanu' in lexicons and 'Hanyamāna' in Mbh. are names of a mixed tribe and a people and country, respectively.

63. Stands for Sans. 'Giri-varta (°tma),' 'Giri-patha' or '°vandha', i.e. Hill Tracts, or Mountain fastnesses or Passes ; seems to be the higher hill country between the Surmā and the Brahmaputra Valleys (Garō, Khasi, Naga and Jainti Hills). Tibetan popular interpretation makes it 'Assam Hills down to Tippera.'

64. 'Spu. kham.' and 'Pa. la. ku.' are supposed to be the Hill Tracts East of Chittagong, the former being their northern half, the latter the southern (towards Arakan). 'Spu. kham.' lit. = 'Hair-Brown' (men) = 'Babhrū'; an Eastern region called 'Babhrū-deśa' is known. Perhaps it is the old name of Manipur Hill Tracts (associated with 'Babhrū-vāhana' of epic fame, 'the Leader of the

ti.⁶⁶, and Mar. go⁶⁷, etc.; also Mu. ñan.⁶⁸; and besides, Cak. ma.⁶⁹, and Kam. po. ca.⁷⁰;—these all are generally known by the name of Ko. ki.⁷⁰.—In the Middle (Country)⁷¹ and towards its Southern limits

Babhrūs or Brown-haired Men'). 'Palaku' may be compared with 'Pālakka' of the Gupta period. Pālakka, Pālaṅga (and variants,—Beta Bengalensis) may be seen in East Bengal place-names like 'Pālaṅ'; it is possible that 'Palaku' survives in the river and valley name 'Barak' in Assam Hills.

65. Modern 'Arakan'; lit. the name means 'Goat-land', and if a Sanskrit equivalent is sought it would be 'Āvika', 'Raurava' (or 'Roruka') or 'Rāmyaka' (which last reminds of 'Ramma' another Tibetan name for the Chittagong—Arakan region); it is to be noted that Lha. sa. was also originally named 'Ra. sa.' = 'Goat-land'; perhaps this was an usual place-name amongst Tibeto-Burman tribes.—Has Paurāṇic 'Rasā-tala' any connexion with this Ra. sa. and Ra. khaṅ?

66. Scriptural mistake for Ha. sa. wa. ti. or Haṅ. sa. wa. ti., i.e., Haṁsāvati, modern Hanthāwadi in Pegu [which again is probably a Tibetan place-name, 'Dpyis. gu., = Beauty-land or Ramya-deśa; cf. 'Ram. ma.' above].

67. Modern 'Mergui' (port, district and islands). The name lit. means 'Lower Regions', i.e. lands in the far South; something like 'Pātāla' or 'Mahī-tala' would be a Sans. equivalent.

68. This is the usual Tibetan name for Burma proper (Irawady Valley); it means 'Ñan' of the remote borderland or 'Further Ñan'; Ñan is the region of Tsang of which Gyang-tse is the chief town; this again seems to be another instance of place-names common to Tibet and Burma (cf. Ra. sa. and Ra. khaṅ).—Elsewhere our author states that after the destruction of the Bāddhist centres of learning in Bāṅgālā and Magadha (1203 ff.), Buddhist scholars migrated to and preached Buddhism in Burma (Mu. ñan.) where the contemporary king was Bāla-vāhana, son of K. Babla-Sundara.

69. 'Cak. ma.' is the same as those hill tracts of Chittagong which are peopled by the Chakma tribes today,—i.e. the valley of the Upper Karnaphulī River. Our author says elsewhere that Buddhism spread here from Bāṅgālā in the 13th century, the contemporary Chakma King being Atīta-vāhana.—'Cak. ma.' is corrupt, for either 'Lcags. ma.' (= 'Iron-source'-land, Sans. equivalent being something like 'Lohajāni'; cf. the East Bengal place-name 'Lohajān(n)'; place names with 'Lcags.' as the chief part thereof are common in Tibet),—or 'Chags. ma.' (= 'Kāminī'-deśa, i.e. 'Strī-rājya', referring to the dominance of women in these hill tracts).

70. Kam. po. ca. [note the 'ca' which reminds one of the peculiar East Bengal pronunciation of 'ja'] = Kāmboja. This may be taken to be = Cambodia and Champā in Indo-China, where (our author notes elsewhere) Buddhism spread after 1203 from Bāṅgālā. But it is perhaps better to take it as = Upper and Eastern Lushai Hill Tracts, since all the regions in this list are stated in the text to be generally called 'Koki'-land, or the country of the Koki (mod. Kuki)

there are also the 'Jvālā-guhā's.⁷²—To the South, beside the Ocean, Ka. na. ṭa.⁷³ Vidyā-nāgara,⁷⁴ Koṇ. ku. na.⁷⁵, Tu. mu. ra. ti.⁷⁶, Dra. pa. li.,⁷⁷ Mālyara,⁷⁸—and included within the region of Ti. liṇ. kṣ.⁷⁹ the country of Ka. liṇ. ka.,⁷⁹ and Kha. gan.,⁸⁰ etc., are situated. Towards

tribes. Mountainous regions were loosely called Kāmboja in ancient and medieval India. But it is possible also that the entire mountainous country of Further India, from Lushai to Annam, was called Kamboja, and the ethnic name of Koki was also geographically applied to the same region,—but in modern times the former name survives in the eastern part of the region, while in the western part the latter name has survived. According to another Tibetan source (Sam. bha. laahi. Lam. yig., quoted by S. C. Das), the name Koki includes Cak. ma. (Chittagong Hills), Hain. sa. wa. ti (Hainsāvati, Hanthāwadī in Pegu) and Haribhadra or Manipur.

71. By this 'madhya-deśa' Magadha is intended here; cf. the meaning of 'Prāci' above.

72. Lit. 'Hidden Fires', i.e. Hot Springs and subterranean fires; these are clearly the Hot Springs of South Bihar near Rājgir, Monghyr, Kharagpur (South Monghyr), etc..

73. I.e., Kaṇṇāṭa, Kaṇṇāḍā country, or the Carnatic.

74. Alternative form of the famous Vijayanagara, founded c. 1336. Tibetans continued to be in touch with Peninsular India till the days of Buddhagupta and Tārānātha (17th century); they maintained close contact with Acintya-Vihāra University (Ajaṇṭa "Caves") till its destruction in early 14th century (a century after Nālanda).

75. I.e. Koṅkaṇa.

76. Either 'Ta. ma. li. ti.' or Tamluk (Tāmralipti), or 'Tāmra-dī- (dvīpa)' = Ceylon,—or 'Dakṣiṇa-Tambula' (Tambula of the South), referred to elsewhere in the text.

77. Also written 'Dra. bi. li.' elsewhere in the text; same as 'Dramila' or 'Drāviḍa' = Tamil-Nāḍu.

78. Prob. corrupt for 'Malaya. ri.' or Malaya Hills, a bilingualism for Tam. 'Malai' = Hills = Tib. 'Ri.'; this is the country of Malabar, Anna-Malai and Ooty hills evidently.

79. Telingana, 'Tri-liṅga' or 'Tri-Kaliṅga'. 'Ka. liṇ. ka.' or Kaliṅga proper is evidently regarded as the most important part of 'the Three Kaliṅgas.'

80. Said to be the same as 'Khagendra-rājya.' Perhaps the reference is to 'Khagāsaṇa' or Udayagiri Hills of Orissa (or Ganjam); alternatively 'Kha. gan.' may be taken as mistake for 'Kha. gyen.' (though 'gan.' is sometimes = 'gyen') or 'Kha. rgyan.'; in the former case it would mean 'upward-mouth' i.e. 'Ut-kala' ['Kala' = voice = mouth, 'Kara' = elephant's trunk = mouth] or Orissa; in the latter case it would mean 'mouth-ornament' = 'Tāmbūla' = Tāmralipti, or 'Tambula' of the North, as dist. from 'Tambula of the South' referred to in the

the South of this,⁸¹ the shape (of the country) becomes triangular, having at the vertex the Ocean ; where (the land) juts into (the Ocean), (there) is Ra. smi. śva. ri.;⁸² ahead of this, on the Ocean of the East direction, Ma. he. da. rdi.,⁸³ and on the Ocean of the West direction, Ra. ta. nā. gi. ri. by name.⁸⁴

In the midst of all this country, the spread of Buddha's Doctrine (occurred) :—

From 'Mañju-śrī-mūla-Tantra':—"Up to the limits of both land and sea,"—thus was the prophecy."

Of the Middle Country to the West from Vārāṇasī,⁸⁵—Prayāga, Mathurā, Ku. ra.,⁸⁶ Pāñcāla, A. ga. ra.,⁸⁷ Sa. ga. ri.,⁸⁸ Ḍi. li.,⁸⁹ and Mā-

text before. In any of the three cases, the region between the Bhāgīrathī and Gaṅjam is indicated.

81. I.e., of Telingana. Mapping and charting was evidently known in India and Tibet in the medieval periods at least.

82. I.e. Rāmeśvara (Setuvandha).

83. Probably 'Maheśvara-dvīpa' ('Maheśa-dī', or in mod. vern. Maheśsaddī), either in East Bengal or in South Chittagong [Cf. 'Maheś-Khāl' channel and island there], across the Bay of Bengal (Ocean of the East-Direction or Prācī). 'Ma. he. da. di.' may be the corrupt form of so many Indian place names (known to lexicons, epics, etc.): e.g., Mahittha-dvīpa, Mahiśādri, Mahendrādri, Mahītaṭa-dvīpa, etc. .

84. Ratnagiri, near Goa and Bombay.

85. Counting from the site of 'Dharma-cakra-pravartana', or 'Dharma-cakra' Stūpa (Dhamek) in Sāranātha (Benares).

86. Kuru country; if the city is meant here, it stands for Hastināpura; similarly the Pāñcāla 'city' would be either Ahicchatra, Sambhala or Kāmpilla.

87. Agra-nagara, or Agra-purī (also known as Agra-dvīpa or simply Agrā), with its 'Agra-purī-Vihāra', where the Buddhist scholar Guṇaprabha lived during the last part of his career. The site of Agra is an ancient one (Buddhist, if not Epic) demanding archæological exploration.

88. Modern 'Sāgar' in Central Provinces, where (according to Tibetan Buddhist tradition), in the 'Uṣma-purī-Vihāra', King Gambhīra-diśa patronised the Buddhist Saṅgha and the famous Ārya-Asaṅga. This site also awaits exploration.

89. Same as later 'Dehli'; this name of the city is said by Rajputṣ to be as old as the 10th century; the city itself is of course older, the oldest settlement being named Indraprastha. As the 'Locāwas' know of 'Di. li.', this name may easily be older than c. 900 A.D.. Our author says elsewhere that Kaṇiṣka ruled over Ḍili and Palava (Pahlava) country; so Ḍili existed in 2nd. or 1st. century A.D. .

lava ; besides these, Maru.-Ḍi. li.,⁹⁰ Hala. Kaccha,⁹¹ etc., it spread over.

*So far, of the Locchās and others' correct opinion according to, has been written duly.*⁹²

90. Probably before the Tomaras founded 'Ḍili' in the fertile Jumna Valley their earlier seat, also called 'Ḍili', was in the Maru, or the desert region of Marwar (cf. Gurjara-Pratihāra migration from Bhūmāl to Kanauj); the 'Locawas' thus knew of two 'Ḍi. li.'s. A third 'Ḍili' seems to be known to our author who says elsewhere that Vindusāra with Cāṇakya's help extended dominions far beyond Ḍili, a city to the North of Mt. Kailāsa.

91. 'Bharu-Kaccha' may be intended ; 'Ha' may be a misscript for 'Bha'. Alternatively, 'Hala' may be taken separately, referring to the Hala country and people of the N. W. (Var. Br. Sam.),—apparently Sindh containing the Hala mountains, —and 'Kaccha' in that case would mean Cutch. Our author in the next section describes the progress of Buddhism in Bharu-Kaccha, Sindhu, Mahārāṣṭra and adjacent regions, in the time of the 8th (or 7th) Hierarch Sudarśana (end of 5th century B.C., acc. to our author's chronological data).

92. That is, this list of regions *in* and adjacent to Madhyadeśa, specially *west* wards, as well as the region lists of the Prācī, the South and Trans-Himalayas, are drawn up according to tradition as recorded by the Tibetan Sanskritists and interpreting Paṇḍits of India, during the period 10th to 14th century. [The form 'Locchā', (note the East Bengal ring about the sound) for 'Lo. ca. wa. (or correctly 'Blo. rca. wa.'). is interesting, as showing the process of Aryanisation of a Tibetan word (itself a translation of a Sanskrit word, 'vyutpanna'); 'locchā' in Bengali later on acquired a very derogatory sense (not an unnatural process), due to degeneration of Tāntrik Buddhism.—In my studies in Tibetan roots I have come across most interesting and instructive philological facts, which are calculated to change many of our current notions about Indo-Aryan dialects of India, and relations of Indo-European races with Tibet.]

KATHĀVATTHU—DR. B. C. LAW'S TRANSLATION

By C. A. F. RHYS DAVIDS

At all times and more or less has man been a seeker. And at all times and more or less has he sought for what he holds to be real, true, not an illusion. What he holds to be such will not in every quest be true, real, in the worth held by another man. In what I here say I am valuing as true, as real that which the modern Buddhist does not so value. I deem I have here the advantage in that I have paid more heed to the history of the Buddhist movement in India than does the modern Buddhist, albeit it is on his own scriptures that my knowledge is based, and not on what chroniclers not Buddhist have recorded.

Consider for instance the subject of this new translation which I would have readers of this Journal welcome. It is the Commentary, ascribed at least to Buddhaghosa, on the fifth book of the Abhidhamma-Piṭaka, entitled *Kathāvatthu*, a text translated by the late S. Z. Aung and myself, and published as *Points of Controversy*, by the Pali Text Society in 1915. This work claims in its Commentary to be a collection of debates held at what is recorded to have been a very important much-deciding council or congress held at Patna in the reign of, and presided over by, king Asoka—a council reckoned by 'Southern' Buddhists as the Third, though Eastern Buddhism does not recognize it. (There is some excuse for this non-recognition, as I have shown elsewhere.¹) Incidentally it may be said, that in all probability only the first *vagga* or book of these 23 deals with the debates held during the long duration of the Council. The remaining 22 deal with dissenting and hence 'heterodox' views held by this or that uprisen sect or school, so that as a whole the work *Kathāvatthu* is a bundle of accretions, of different dates. The 22 are not without historical interest, but in this respect the first book, especially its first cluster of debates is of outstanding historical interest. And yet I have still to see both debates and council discussed sympathetically or critically by any writers calling themselves Buddhist. Especially those who would call themselves converts to Buddhism. For theirs is not the Buddhist tradition; their adopted faith for them stands or falls according to the truth of what is recorded about this council, and in these debates. Yet they ignore it. I admit that most converts to Christianity are equally content to remain in

1. *Manual of Buddhism* (S.P.C.K.), p. 293.

parallel ignorance, and cannot afford, if they would, to blame converts to Buddhism.

What is it then that was such a crisis during those months at Patna? I have dealt with this elsewhere,² and must here be brief. Briefly, a great change had been coming over the teaching we now call 'Buddhism.' More truly I should say: had come over... Scriptures tell less what is going on than what has taken place. In the Pali Canon we find formulated teachings repeated and emphasized; we find also other teachings also formulated, but not emphasized. These, but not those, are in keeping with the religious teaching holding the field in Indian culture when 'Buddhism' began. These do not harmonize with those. We judge the latter, the unemphasized, as older, because they are against the trend of the emphasized formulas, because these are intensified in later exegesis, because the attitude or postulate which made the unemphasized sayings rational was at Patna tried and rejected. At that Council, in those debates, it was decided, that, in the complex making up a 'man,' there was not a body and mind *used by* a spirit or self, but that the man was nothing more than what was used. Or, as it was also worded, the man was just a bundle (*puñjamattam*) of fleeting phenomena called *dhammā*.

Now Patna was a new centre of the Buddhist 'church'; the relatively new centre of the new Mauryan dynasty. An earlier centre of that church was Vesālī or Vaisālī, and there it was still upheld, that the Master had taught that the man, over and above his instruments, was real. To this extent the older Indian culture was maintained. Lost, even by Vaisālī, was the seeing in the man potential Deity:—the Immanence belonging to that culture. But the spirit or self, if not of Divine nature, was none the less a true entity, who used, who valued by, believed or doubted by, judged and spoke by body and mind, who dissolved not at death with earth-mind and body, but fared further, assuming new body and mind-ways. This, they held firmly, was the founder's teaching.

Thus at Patna, where delegates from Vesālī engaged in debate on this matter with members of the Patna new orthodoxy, the man-as-real was fighting for his life, with his back to the wall. The outcome of the debates was virtually the slaying of him. I say virtually, because the debate-thesis was, not 'Does man, as not body and mind, exist?', but the more Humian 'Is the man got at (*upalabbhati*) in the true highest meaning?' The Patna Buddhists denying this, denying therefore with that man as a growing entity persisted not for this life only, *opened the way* for the later crude denial that he existed at all, save

2. *Op. cit.*; Sakya, p. 357; *Outlines of Buddhism*, p. 97.

as a mere conventional label in popular speech, and that in nothing whatever was there any thing that might be called spiritual 'substance'.

Already, in the Debates Commentary we see the author or authors of the first written version, whenever and wherever that was accomplished, inserting a 'coda' to the first debate-group, explaining as antithetical the man in the popular or conventional sense (*sammutikathā*) and the man in the ultimate sense (*paramatthakathā*), and how the status of a learner is reckoned according as he can be taught about man in the one idiom or the other, "even as the Blessed One taught"—a tragic liberty to take with the records, since this distinction is nowhere hinted at in the first two Piṭakas. Even had the distinction been definitely taught at the time of the Patna Council, we should certainly have seen the Sakavādin, or representative of Us, the orthodox, *using it in debate*. But he never does. One term of the antithesis is certainly there, in the thesis. But its opposite, *sammuli*, does not appear till a later Book of Debates (V. 6), and then, without the opposite, in a very different context.

Surely then it should be held by Buddhists of primary importance to consider carefully the profound significance of this crossing of the Rubicon³ at Patna : the nailing the unreality of the very Man to the cross, the expulsion of many who protested they, and only they, were holding to their Master's teaching. Can they be so very confident, that the monks who had led the Saṅgha since, say, the date of the Second Council had guided themselves by the inward prompting of that Dhamma, that 'Deitie in my bosom' named by their founder as his sole (and permanent) successor? Do we not rather discern, if we heed well their scripture, how it was no longer a gospel for every man that was being taught, but chiefly a teaching for the monk by the monk? A teaching which was making, not an ever finer life through the world's man's religious quest, but the seeing in life a Less that had so to be lived as to be brought to an end by the rounding off of it by the 'arahan'? A teaching which, so far from seeing in the man divine promise, brought in a cheapening and lowering designation for him in the word *puggala* being used for man-as-entity, instead of *purisa* or *attā* or *jīva*, as if, shall we say, Jesus had spoken of a man as a wight, a swain, a guy, a fellow? The Commentaries even analyze this ugly word as meaning 'hell-swallower'! English readers cannot see this heavy handicap suffered by the translator. But for the Buddhist student in the long past, this derogatory term must have coloured the whole of this group of debates on the "puggala". The

3. Cf. my article 'A Buddhist Rubicon,' *New Review*, October, 1939.

protesters of Vesālī⁴ cannot possibly have been content with being dubbed as Puggalavādins, as the orthodox appear to have called them.

Nor can we be sure that, in the record of these debates, we have the rejoinders or propositions of the 'Speaker for the Man' fairly and truly recorded. As expelled from the Saṅgha at the decision of the Council, because he would not 'analyze' the 'man' into a complex only, he will have been helpless as to the fate awaiting a record, oral and subsequently written, of his utterances. He may have tried to partake in the recording ; he was certainly not successful. For he would certainly have spurned the clumsy logic of his opponent. The *Kathāvatthu* is probably the earliest Indian work composed by way of a deductive logic closely resembling the Aristotelian syllogism. We have only in our own day come to see, that the quest of the true requires, not so much a method of deductive consistency as the inductive building up of premisses. The orthodox speaker is ever treating the 'All S is P' as meaning that S is the whole of P. The other is, alas ! dumbly, only protesting, that S may be P, but only Px, not Py.

For instance the defender maintains, that "man (S) persists through becoming" (P). The orthodox maintains that persisting through becoming includes decay (after maturing). Now would you admit that your real man, i.e. spirit, decays ? The protestant is merely made to reject this. Actually he will have tried to say : Nay, persistence in becoming may be Px, i.e. of things material liable to decay, or it may be Py, i.e. of things spiritual. But this he is not recorded as saying, and is merely made to look ridiculous. It is possible of course, that Vesālī had not cultivated the new logic, and hence spoke at great disadvantage. There is nothing in the Commentary to inform us, and I confess to getting the impression, that we have here children of the day of a new discovery in speech playing clumsily with a new weapon.

Well, this interesting novelty in Buddhist literature has now been made more accessible to readers of English by the enterprise and energy of Dr. Bimala Churn Law. He has translated for the Pali Text Society the Commentary on the Debates, generously covering most of the cost of printing. He has worked at great disadvantage, in that the Pali text, edited 51 years ago by Minayeff from, it would appear, only two Mss., Singhalese and Burmese, long before the Siamese edition appeared, is very badly punctuated. Nor does it in every case correctly name which of the two debaters is speaking.

4. We might render this by Bloke-ists !

Of this I would like to give what is, I believe, a case in point. In § 234 of the text (P.T.S. ed) 'our speaker' cites a verse from the *Sutta-Nipāta* (1119) bidding the questioner "look upon the world as void"....i.e. of spirit (*attā*), hence it is futile to seek for a veritably existing 'man' in it. Our speaker then asks "Is it a *person* here who 'looks upon'?" The Commentary follows up thus: "The Opponent is so asked because he contends that he who so 'looks upon' is a person (*puggalo'ti*). 'Our speaker' is then shown as shifting the point to whether the 'looker' is one and the same as his 'looking' faculty. Now I venture to think that, in this citation, whichever made it, the 'Opponent' (*paravādin*) will have really contended, and not merely acquiesced, as, in the text only, he is said to do. He would, in fact, have been following the argument accredited to his Master in the Second Nikāya⁵, that the self, spirit or 'man' is a More than his instruments. Body is what is willed (to 'look', etc.). Mind is the willing, the looking (the perception). But the looker, the willer to look, is the 'man'. If, Gotama is shown saying, you reduce your judging, who disposes of the lives and property of his subjects, to being no more than one of these, where then is the ruler and adjudicator you say exists? That the appeals to authority in the debate do not include this striking vindication by the Founder himself (as alleged) may set us wondering. I admit, that the simile is so editorially smothered, that even Vesālī may have come to overlook it. Anyway, the citing of the 'looker' was a strong point for the man of Vesālī, and that he is shown failing to use it with effect may leave us doubtful as to the honesty of the editor.

One more point may be mentioned where, for me, the 'our speaker' shows in a bad cause the better discernment. The 'opposer' of Vesālī contends that at least abnormal psychic gifts demand the postulate of a personal agent to exercise them (p. 38). The orthodox view is to reject such an intermittent agency, and that such a gift constitutes a reason for vindicating by the agent his reality. In other words either the very man (or self) must be a constant reality or unreal. It was a hedging in protest, unlike the prevailing defence.

This defence was not so much a well thought out position as the stand of traditional loyalty to 'what the Master had taught.' For that matter tradition in the Sayings is used as a weapon by both sides, to show, not so much affirmation of man's reality, as sayings *implying* it, or implying the opposite. Never must it be forgotten, that when the

5. *Majjhima-Nikāya*, Sutta 35. Cf. *J.R.A.S.* 1937: 'An overlooked Buddhist Simile.'

Founder lived and taught, the reality of the very man, self or spirit was so strongly affirmed and glorified, that to have denied it would have seemed the word of a mad man. There was *no need for Gotama to affirm*. And this may well be the reason, rather than any editorial manipulation, why the loyal and loving Vesālī follower had come so ill equipped with convincing reasons as to his own reality as a real 'person.' He shows himself as ill prepared as is, say, any modern psychologist, excepting our own James Ward. He loved and believed. And we call to mind that last look of the aged Founder as on leaving Vesālī he turned, and called Ānanda to heed his farewell.

Taken then by and large, the translation of the *Kathāvatthu Commentary* is, for this English editor of today, not one that was commended to Dr. Law without some misgiving. As Professor Helmer Smith has reminded me, a more critical edition of the Pali should have preceded it. But this would have postponed the present achievement indefinitely. And amid much that is a mere endorsing from an altogether prejudiced standpoint, there are in the Commentary here and there points of interest. I am not referring to the names of earlier or later sects whose views are debated, since Aung and I inserted portions of these in our *Points of Controversy*. I refer, as of chief historical interest, to the above-mentioned 'Coda' by a hand obviously later than the day of the first debate, on the esoteric distinction between popular and metaphysical, which seems to have 'come in', so different from the repudiation of the 'teacher's fist' ascribed in the Suttas to the Founder himself. This coda alone is worth a translation of at least Book I.

There is, further, interest in the Commentator's analysis of the new syllogistic process. And there is a richer interest in another historical emergence, namely of the term *bhavaṅga*, in which I have ventured, in my *Milinda Questions* to see, not the accepted *bhava-āṅga*, but an old obscured abstract noun *bhavaṅgya* as a name for man's vital continuum, as not a *Sat* (being), but a *Bhavya* (becoming). This term is used in the last book of the Piṭakas, but not in this book, the last but two (albeit at one time the last). That such a term is needed in certain debates is felt by the Commentator, to whom it will have been familiar. And by 'the Commentator' I mean of course not the earlier exponents orally explaining the text, or the first writers of the oral, whether in India or Ceylon. I have in mind the transcription from Singhalese into Pali said to have been made by that Omar Khayyam of dumped credit, Buddhaghosa. In *bhavaṅga* I think that Aung and I made perhaps too free with our modern term sub- or subliminal consciousness. As contrasted in the *Compendium of Philosophy* (*Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha*) with the *vīthi-citta* or process of perception our term is strongly suggested. Nevertheless any verbal equivalent of sub- or

subliminal is just not there, at that time. It is too modern to be used.

And there is finally a delightful psychological aperçu in the Commentary (VI, 7) on the debate "Is space visible?", wherein the Andhaka school contends, that we see the interval between encircling objects known to be solid, against the 'Us', who maintains, that we only infer it. Here it is of interest that neither text nor commentary uses the word *anumāna*, a term emerging, it would seem, only in later Buddhist logic. Earlier too, we find the Founder made to use, for inference, the unspecialized term *takka*. Clairvoyantly he has seen his deceased supporter Anāthapiṇḍika, now a *deva*. Ānanda, less gifted, ascribes the *deva*'s words to Anāthapiṇḍika, because they include praise of Sāriputta, whom he had loved. "Well done, Ānanda," is the comment, "as far as one can get by *takka*, you have got." Only the (later) Commentary explains by the later term *anumāna-buddhiyā*. This Commentary explains, not by this term, but by *manodvāra-viññāṇam uppajjati, na cakkhuvīññāṇam* : "arises as awareness of the gate of mind, not as visual awareness." Exegesis, we may note, had not got so far as to distinguish muscular movement as a co-efficient in vision. Still it leaves no doubt of psychological progress in the fifth century A.D.

No doubt either will remain with the reader as to the debt owed by Buddhist research to the spirited, gifted and generous translator in a task that cannot in any literary sense have brought its own reward in the doing.

ON THE EMPEROR MAHĪPĀLA OF THE PRATIHĀRA DYNASTY

By H. C. RAY CHAUDHURI

Mahīpāla is one of the most famous kings of the Pratihāra line. The Haddālā Inscription gives for him a date in Śaka Samvat 836, that is, A.D. 914, and points to his supremacy over eastern Kāthiāvāḍ,¹ while the Asnī record of V.S. 974, that is, A.D. 917-18, implies control over Fatehpur in the United Provinces.² Rājasekhara, who refers to this prince as the sovereign of Āryāvarta, ascribes to him in the *Pracaṇḍa-Pāṇḍava* extensive conquests in the Deccan as well as in North-Western India. The king figures also in the *Vikramārjunaviḷaya* of the Kanarese poet Pampa as an antagonist of Narasimha,³ apparently a feudatory-or general of Indra III Rāṣṭrakūṭa, who is known to have ruled from A.D. 915 to 917.

The prevailing view amongst scholars is that Mahīpāla bore at least three other names—Kṣitipāla, Vināyakapāla and Herambapāla. The ascription of these names to Mahīpāla rests primarily on the theory, first adumbrated by Kielhorn,⁴ that *Hayapati* Devapāla, the son of Herambapāla mentioned in a Candella Inscription, was identical with the Devapāla of Mahodaya or Kanauj, the successor of Kṣitipāladeva mentioned in the Siyaḍonī Inscription of V.S. 1005, i.e., A.D. 948-49, and partly on the equations Mahī=Kṣiti and Vināyaka=Heramba. The identification of Mahīpāla with Vināyakapāla extends the period of his reign to V.S. 988, i.e., A.D. 931-32, and possibly to V.S. 1000 (A.D. 942-3), if not to V.S. 1011 (953-54).⁵ It further makes him the step-brother and successor of Parama-Vaiṣṇava Mahārāja Śrī Bhojadeva (II) mentioned in the so-called Bengal Asiatic Society's Plate of Paramādityabhakta Mahārāja Śrī Vināyakapāladeva.⁶

1. *Ind. Ant.* XII. 193-94.

2. *ibid.* XVI. 173ff.

3. *Dynasties of the Kanarese Districts*, p. 380.

4. *Épigraphia Indica*, Vol. I, p. 171; II, 124; Majumdar, *Gurjara-Pratihāras*, p. 59; Ray, D.H.N.I., 572.

5. Rakheta Ins., D.H.N.I., i, 585; Khajuraho ins., cf. *Gurjara-Pratihāra*, p. 54n.

6. *Ind. Ant.* XV. 138ff.

The only dissentients from this view, so far as I know, are Pandit Gaurishankar Hirachand Ojha,⁷ Dr. Nihar Ranjan Ray⁸ and the present writer.⁹ It has been pointed out¹⁰ that "*Hayapati* was never the accepted title of the Pratihāra kings of Mahodaya and is not met with in their inscriptions" and that the dates of Mahipāla and Vināyaka do not overlap. The attitude of the Candellas towards the *Hayapati* and his father Herambapāla is certainly different from the reverential tone in which a king named Vināyakapāla is mentioned in the Khajuraho record: "While the illustrious Vināyakapāladeva is protecting the earth, the earth is not taken possession of by the enemies, who have been annihilated." It is further to be noted that the Asnī record of Mahipāla (A.D. 917-18) makes no mention of Bhoja II for whom Vināyaka evinces great regard in the Asiatic Society's Plate of A.D. 931-32:

"*Mahendrapāladevastasya putrastatpādānudhyātaḥ Śrī-Dehanāgādevyām utpannaḥ Parama-Vaiṣṇavo Mahārāja-Śrī-Bhojadevastasya bhrātā Śrī Mahendrapāladevaputrastayoh pādānudhyātaḥ Śrī Mahīdevīdevyām utpannaḥ Paramādityabhakto Mahārāja Śrī Vināyakapāladevaḥ.*"

The anomaly of ignoring a brother and predecessor in one record (Asnī) and honouring "his feet" equally with those of the royal father himself in another (As. Society's Plate), has not been satisfactorily explained by upholders of the older view. Furthermore, the name Mahipāla is invariably applied to the Pratihāra monarch of the years 914-17 not only in records of the family and its feudatories but also in those of antagonists as well, and, as pointed out by Dr. R. C. Majumdar¹¹, the name Vināyakapāla is not met with till a later period. Professor V. V. Mirashi quotes in the *K. B. Pathaka Commemoration Volume* a passage from the drama *Caṇḍakauśika* of Kṣemiśvara in which Śrī-Mahipāladeva is styled Kārttikeya.¹² Now if, as suggested by some scholars, Vināyakapāla is to be equated with Herambapāla on the ground that the words *Heramba* and *Vināyaka* are synonymous, may it not be urged with equal cogency that the person in question

7. *Ep. Ind.* XIV. 180.

8. *Ind. Ant.* LVII. 230ff.

9. *Gurjara-Pratihāras* (1923), p. 54, n. 6.

10. *Ep. Ind.* XIV. 180.

11. Cf. *Gurjara-Pratihāras*, 62.

12. P. 361 n.; Jīvānanda Vidyāsagara's ed. pp. 4, 173: *Ādiṣṭo'smi*.....

Lakṣmīsvayaṁvarapraṇayinā Śrī Mahipāladevena....

Tasya kṣatrapasūterbhramatu jagadidaṁ Kārttikeyasya kīrtiḥ
pāre kṣīrākhyasindhoraṇi kaviyaśasā sārddhamagresareṇa,.....

must be distinguished from Kārttikeya? Is it not permissible to hold that just as the divine Kārttikeya is a brother of the divine Vināyaka, the king Kārttikeya, that is, Mahīpāla, is a brother of, and not identical with, king Vināyakapāla? The point certainly requires further investigation.

As to the rival theory, *viz.* the identity of Mahīpāla with Bhoja II (and *not* Vināyaka) preferred by Dr. Nihar Ranjan Ray, there is much that can be urged in support of this view. This may satisfactorily explain the non-occurrence of the name "Mahīpāla" in the Bengal Asiatic Society's Plate. While epigraphic evidence clearly distinguishes Vināyaka from Bhoja there is no such evidence to distinguish Mahīpāla from the same prince. Records mentioning the name Mahīpāla omit the name Bhoja and the inscription that refers to Bhoja II omits Mahīpāla. The omission of Bhoja II's name in the Asnī record has been sought to be explained by a recent writer¹³ "either by the extreme shortness of Bhoja's reign, or by the assumption that there was a war of succession and at first the victorious claimant did not think it prudent to recall on stone the existence of one whom he had overthrown. But when with the lapse of time his memory had faded away, he felt no scruples in mentioning the name of his rival in the genealogical list." Both the alternative theories—the shortness of Bhoja II's reign and a war of succession—lack proof. If Bhoja's name is omitted in the Asnī record because of the shortness of his rule, why was it mentioned so prominently in the Asiatic Society's Plate? Not only does the so-called vanquished rival figure in the last mentioned record but he is referred to in a way which leaves no room for doubt that Vināyaka had almost the same regard for him as for his father Mahendrapāla-deva.¹⁴

In this connection attention may be invited to an extract from Mas'ūdi noted by Mr. Hodivala in his *Studies in Indo-Muslim History*.¹⁵ The extract in question is usually translated thus:—

"The king of Kanauj.... is *Bauūra*. This is a *title* common to all kings of Kanauj."

In commenting on this passage Mr. Hodivala observes that the right reading seems to be not *Bauūra* but *Bozah*, *Bozoh* or *Bodzah* i.e., Bhoja. Mas'ūdi, it may be remembered, visited India in the years c. 300-04 A.H. i.e. A.D. 912-16.¹⁶ If the reading suggested by Mr.

13. Dr. R. S. Tripathi, *History of Kanauj*, p. 255.

14. Cf. the passage *tayoh pādānudhyātah* etc.

15. P. 25.

16. *JRAS*, 1909, 271; *Gurjara Pratihāras*, p. 64; DHNI, i, 578 n1,

Hodivala turns out to be correct, the identification of Mahīpāla who is known to have ruled from 914 to 917 with Bhoja II cannot be dismissed as altogether implausible. Bhoja II was a Parama-Vaiṣṇava and a son of Queen Dehanāgā. The question of his identity will be finally settled when the name of Mahīpāla's mother is revealed to us and we have fuller details about the religious proclivities of that king. The epithet *Śrīnidhi* applied to Bhojadeva in the Bilhari Inscription¹⁷ recalls the eulogy of Śrī Mahīpāla in the *Caṇḍa-Kauśika*, "*samara-sāgarāntarbhramad-bhujadaṇḍa-mandarākṛṣṭa-Lakṣmī-svayamvaraprāṇa-yi*".¹⁸

17. *Ep. Ind.* I. 256.

18. Jivānanda's ed. p. 4.

ADMINISTRATION UNDER THE PĀLAS & THE SENAS.

By BENOY CHANDRA SEN

The administrative condition of Bengal from about the middle of the eighth century to the end of the twelfth is pictured in the inscriptions of the Pālas, the Candras, the Varmans, the Kāmbojas and the Senas. A close study of these records shows that the administrative system generally followed in this period, though uniform throughout in its main outline, was subject to changes and modifications as occasions arose. Secondly, it is also evident that when the period opens, it does not start exactly with the same system as is known to have prevailed in the preceding age.

In the eighth century A.D., when Bengal under the leadership of the Pālas found herself in the role of an imperial power confronting the task of administering large territorial possessions scattered over a wide area, she simply could not do without looking out for precedents elsewhere. Unlike Magadha from the days of the Mauryas down to the end of the Gupta Age, she herself did not possess any long-standing systematic experience in the art of administering an empire. No doubt with the collapse of the Gupta empire attempts were made by some local dynasties in the province to extend the boundaries of their states, but they are not definitely known to have attained an imperial status in the real sense of the expression, not in the sense in which panegyrists understand it. The case of Śaśāṅka may be pointed to as an exception, but it is commonly held that even he was originally connected with the Guptas; it is also almost certain that his career began outside Bengal, as the Rohtāgarḥ seal which furnishes the earliest evidence of his power seems to show.

The imperial history of Bengal definitely commences from the time of the foundation of the Pāla dynasy, when she had to find out and apply a system suitable for administering her developing dominion.

The early Pālas cannot claim much originality in respect of the administrative machinery which they put into operation. The system already stood more or less complete at the time of the Deo-Baranark

1. Fleet, *Corpus Insc. Ind.*, III, pp. 213 ff. An earlier instance is the Banskhera copper-plate of Harṣavardhana, see *Ep. Ind.*, IV, pp. 208 ff.

inscription of Jīvitagupta II¹ which mentions a number of official designations also to be found in the inscriptions of the Pāla period.

The government which prevailed throughout the period was wholly of a monarchical type. There is little evidence of the existence of any constitutional authority by which the conduct of a king could be controlled. The *Rāmacarita* by Sandhyākara Nandī records the case of a Pāla king, Mahipāla II, ruling in a capricious and despotic manner, not paying any heed to the counsel of his ministers, but there was nothing in the whole system of government which could make this impossible. It was a single individual who revolted against the oppressive rule and organised a movement which brought about its end. In fact there is no clear picture of a definite form of constitution in the inscriptions of the period. It is the king and his family whose glory is constantly harped upon in a tireless strain. Among the many records from which the history of the different ruling families of the period is to be recovered, there is only one, the *Badal Praśasti*² which emphasises the importance of a certain family of ministers. If this were the only source of information, the formulation of the theory that kings in those days were mere puppets in the hands of their ministers might have been justified to a certain extent. But this view is contradicted by a large mass of evidence which points to the king as the sole idealised hero, apart from whom the state had no existence, and who in truth was the state, as understood in those days. The *Badal Praśasti* which depicts the achievements of a Brahmin family producing successive generations of ministers who served under the Pālas from Gopāla I to Śūrapāla I may have pitched the claims of the family too high; for in the official records of the Pālas there is no corroboration of its evidence in so far as, if at all, it raises the prestige and power of the ministers' family above those of the king. What the inscription may at the most prove is that nothing could prevent a king from offering his personal homage to a Brahmin minister, but this did not mean any deterioration of his supreme authority as the paramount head of the government. The influence secured by such a minister, as shown in the *Badal Praśasti* was of a personal character, due to his good services to the king, but not to any constitutional right which could be duly enforced.

It may be safely mentioned here that there was the possibility of a constitutional development of a far-reaching character on the eve of the accession of the Pālas. At that time the country witnessed a general collapse of royal authority; it appeared as if everybody

tried to seize power and bring others under his subjection. But there was yet no apprehension of the failure of monarchy as a system, so deep-rooted it had become in the consciousness of the people. It was felt that only a strong ruler could save the country from the crisis into which it had been plunged, not that kingship as an institution had failed, and consequently a different form of government should be given a trial. Gopāla was acclaimed as the right type of ruler capable of steering the vessel of the state across troubled waters.

A question of constitutional importance is involved in the manner in which Gopāla came to occupy the throne. The verse in the Khālimpur inscription of Dharmapāla,³ the son and successor of Gopāla, stating the circumstances in which the Pāla dynasty was founded, uses two words of a technical character, viz. *Mātsyanyāya* and *Prakṛti*. The Kauṭīliya, speaking of the origin of the state of *mātsyanyāya*, defines the term as follows : *Apraṇīte hi mātsyanyāyam udbhāvayati Balīyān abalam hi grasate daṇḍadharābhāve* i.e. "When the law of punishment is kept in abeyance, it gives rise to such disorder as is implied in the proverb of fishes (meaning that a great fish swallows a small one); for in the absence of a magistrate, the strong will swallow the weak, but under his protection the weak resist the strong." According to Indian speculators, monarchy had its origin amidst circumstances characterising a state of *mātsyanyāya* : *mātsyanyāy-ābhībhūtāḥ prajā Manuṃ Vaivasvataṃ rājānaṃ cakrire*⁴ ("People suffering from anarchy as illustrated by the proverbial tendency of a large fish swallowing a small one first elected Manu, the Vaivasvata, to be their king"). The political condition of the country on the eve of Gopāla's accession, described as a state of *mātsyanyāya*, was such as to require the concerted action of the affected people to be put an end to. The term '*Prakṛti*,' therefore, which has been used in the Khālimpur Plate to denote the agent that brought about the end of the state of *mātsyanyāya* in which the country had been placed, should have the same meaning as the word '*Prajā*,' employed in the Kauṭīliya, denoting those who removed 'anarchy' by electing Vaivasvata Manu as their king. *Mātsyanyāya* is a recurrent phenomenon ; it appears whenever there is failure of the law of punishment, i.e. whenever the kingly authority is non-existent. The situation which arose in Bengal was unlike one common to a state of temporary uncertainty, confusion and disorder marking a period of transition from one regime to another. At such a time there was the need of all combining together to find out a solution. The use of the word

3. Ep. Ind., IV, pp. 247 ff.

4. I, 13.

'Prakṛti' in the sense of people in general is to be found in two earlier inscriptions⁵ (Damodarpur No. 3....⁶ Faridpur Plate). In this sense the word is also used in the Arthaśāstra : *Arāja-bīja-lubdhah kṣudrapariṣatke virakta-prakṛtir* ...). The Arthaśāstra also gives the name Prakṛti to each of the elements the king, the minister, the country, the fort, the treasury, the army and the ally (*Svāmy-amātya-janapada-durga-koṣa-daṇḍamitrāṇi prakṛtayah*), the aggregate of which constituted a state ruled by a monarch. This theory regarding the constituent elements of sovereignty is known to the author of the Kamauli *Prāśasti* of Vaidyadeva (*Sapt-āṅga-kṣitipādhitvam*—verse 12). An existing kingdom is endowed with these factors, but where there is no kingdom, no state, no form of recognised political authority, what is to be meant by the '*prakṛtayah*' that placed the crown on the head of Gopāla? Out of the elements mentioned in the Kauṭīliya, although scattered and disintegrated owing to the absence of an acknowledged ruling authority, the *daṇḍa* and the *janapada*, i.e. the soldiery and the country-folk, may have taken part in the election of the king in association with others like those who had served as minister under monarchs whom they later discarded, and it is quite likely that this movement had the financial support (*koṣa*) behind it which it needed in order to have proved a success. It can be shown that in the earlier period local leadership in villages and districts had been quite an effective and serviceable factor of the prevailing system of administration. In such limited regions individuals designated *Mahattaras* and various institutions of local-government had been accustomed for centuries to functions of a responsible character. It is probable that local authorities of such types connected with a comparatively small area joined together or took the initiative in electing a sovereign, who afterwards gradually extended his sphere of authority, so that the whole country came to accept his rule. But as there is nothing on record showing such activities on their part as were commensurate with the dignity and importance of which evidence is supplied by the act of the election, it may be that there had been no system in vogue requiring regular meetings of large popular assemblies for any kind of normal constitutional business connected with the central executive of a state. That the people were at first treated with respect even by the head of the state is shown by the importance attached by Dharmapāla to the good opinion of the people which he enjoyed throughout his dominion. The Khālimpur grant of this monarch

5. Prakṛti in the sense of subjects is probably used in the Hāthigumphā inscription of Khāravela, see Ep. Ind., XX, pp. 71 ff.

6. Ep. Ind., XV, p. 136; Ind. Ant. 1910.

unlike the later inscriptions of the family also contain expressions which seem to show that local leaders were held by him in high regard and esteem. The omission of these as well as the non-mention of the part played by the *Prakṛtis* in the establishment of the Pāla dynasty in the subsequent records does not seem to be without some significance. It is not unlikely that the Pālas who had owed so much to the people on the onset of their career consolidated their position so effectively by stamping out the evils of lawlessness and by making conquests abroad that they very soon felt free to go the way they liked without having to seek popular approval or consent. Moreover, having secured the active association of some generations of very capable ministers whose work is praised in the Badal *Praśasti*, the early Pāla kings felt themselves well fortified. Those who had elected Gopāla do not appear to have attempted to devise a new constitution for themselves.

With these introductory remarks we may now proceed to examine the system of administration as it actually worked. Royal titles remained as in the preceding period. To these usual titles the Sena kings added their own *birudas*. The *birudas* assumed by Vijayasena, Vallālasena, Lakṣmaṇasena, Viśvarūpasena and Keśavasena were respectively Arivṛṣabha-Śaṅkara, Arirāja-Niḥśaṅka-Saṅkara, Arirāja-Madana-Śaṅkara, Arirāja-Vṛṣabhāṅka-Śaṅkara and Arirāja-Asahya-Śaṅkara.

The king's eldest son, as usual, was meant for heir-apparency (*yauvarājyam*). As to his duties and functions no detailed information is supplied. One such Yuvarāja or heir-apparent (Tribhuvana-pāla) carried out the duties of a messenger in connexion with the Khālimpur Plate; another, viz. Rājyapāla, was entrusted with similar business in the matter of the Munger grant.⁷ Vīgrahapāla, the Pāla king, abdicated in favour of his son Nārāyaṇapāla who had been acting as the *Yuvarāja* at the time of the renunciation of the throne by his father.⁸ The term *kumāra* was applied to a son of the king appointed to a high administrative post such as a provincial governorship. The *Kumāra* sometimes gave a good account of himself by taking part in the reigning king's military campaigns. Thus Lakṣmaṇasena, in his youth, before his installation as king, appears to have participated in some victorious expeditions (Mādhānagar grant).⁹ Rāmapāla used to hold consultations with his sons, particularly Rājyapāla, in connexion with his war-preparations against the

7. Ep. Ind., XVIII, pp. 304 ff.

8. Ind. Ant., XV, pp. 305 ff.; A. K. Maitreya, *Gaudalekhamālā*, pp. 56 ff.

9. JPASB., V, pp. 471 ff. N. G. Majumdar, *Inscr. of Beng.*, pp. 109 ff.

Kaivarttas, the collapse of whose power was not only the greatest achievement of his reign but one of the notable episodes of the closing period of Pāla history.

Not only the king and his son¹⁰ or sons were interested in the government, but the former's cousins also sometimes intimately associated themselves with its policy and activities. Dharmapāla and his son Devapāla were each in turn assisted generously by their respective cousins, Vākpāla and Jayapāla, in the prosecution of their military plans. The Sāhitya Pariṣat grant of Viśvarūpasena gives the names of two Kumāras, Sūryasena and Puruṣottamasena, recording the presentation of a plot of land measuring 10 Udānas by the former to Halāyudha on his birth-day (*varṣavṛddhau*- 1.54),¹¹ and the gift of another plot measuring 24 Udānas by the other Kumāra. The Kumāra used to have his own amātyas, styled *Kūmārāmātyas*. Whether such *Amātyas*, distinguished from the *Rājāmātyas*, were to be attached only to those among the Kumāras who had been appointed to provincial governorships, or to all, whether free or in such service, is not clear. From the inscriptions of the earlier period it appears that the *Kumārāmātyas* used to be appointed as *viśayapatis* or district officers. This was generally regarded as a matter principally reserved for a *Kumāra*. Consequently, those who were to be appointed as *Viśayapatis* were usually recruited from the rank of the *Kumārāmātyas*. There is no direct evidence in the inscriptions of the period to show that there was any incident of internal dissension among the many royal families whose history is to be found in these records. The Rāmacarita commentary, however, has preserved some authentic information regarding the most serious fratricidal quarrel that broke out during the reign of Mahīpāla II, in the course of which one brother, Rāmapāla seems to have been thrown into prison, and another, Śūrapāla, was probably done away with at a subsequent stage. The death of another king in the family Gopāla III was probably engineered by his uncle Madanapāla, as suggested by verse 18 of the latter's Manahali grant, combined with the evidence of the Rāmacarita, IV. 12. A study of the earlier inscriptions of the Pālas raises the suspicion that a violent struggle for power may have broken out in the royal family after the death of Devapāla, leading to a change in the line of succession. But for want of definite evidence this suspicion cannot be converted into a certainty.

In the initiation of policy and in the devising of means to give effect to it, the king surely had to turn to his ministers who must

10. Note the term *rājaputra* in the Khālimpur plate.

11. Majumdar, loc. cit., pp. 143 ff.

have lived in the capital of his dominion, so that they might be directly available to him in the conduct of central administration. It may be noted here that none of the Brahmin advisers mentioned in the Badal *Prasasti* has been actually designated a minister, but their functions as referred to in the inscription were actually those of a minister or counsellor. In this inscription Garga claims to have made Dharmapāla the master of the 'whole world' (*Dharmaḥ kṛtas-tadadhipas-tv-akhilāsu dikṣu*). His son Darbhapāṇi made the long stretch of territory extending from the Himalayas to the Vindhya tributary to Dharmapāla's son and successor, Devapāla; this achievement was due to the policy said to have emanated from him (*nītyā*). Darbhapāṇi's son Someśvara who also flourished in Devapāla's reign has been described as *parameśvara-vallabha* or one enjoying the confidence of the sovereign. His son Keḍāramiśra is credited with the whole responsibility for the success that attended Devapāla's relations with the Utkalas, the Hūṇas, the Gurjaras and the Draviḍas. Keḍāramiśra, his son, was associated with the reign of Śūrapāla, and his son was Guravamiśra whose skill in and devotion to polity won the admiration of his sovereign Nārāyaṇapāla. It was this Bhaṭṭa Guravamiśra who acted as a messenger in connexion with the Bhāgalpur grant of Nārāyaṇapāla. There are two verses in the Badal *Prasasti*, from which one may be tempted to draw the inference that the influence exercised by this Brahmin family was so great that even the Pāla kings who received the benefit of its guidance and advice, particularly in the conduct of their foreign policy, had to acknowledge themselves as inferior to it. Verse 6 states that Devapāla had to wait at the gate of Darbhapāṇi for an interview with him (*tasthau Śrī-Devapālo nṛpatir-avasara-āpekṣayā dvāri yasya*). The next verse records that this king first offered him "a chair of state" before seating himself on the throne (*dattvāpy-analpam-uḍupa-cchavi-pīṭham-agre yasy-āsanam narapatiḥ surarāja-kalpah nānā-narendra-mukut-āṅkita-pādā-pāniśuḥ simhāsanam sacakitaḥ svayam-āsasāda*). It is difficult to agree with A. K. Maitreya¹² who holds that the Pālas were most anxious to pay homage to these ministers and to do nothing that might displease them for this reason that they were the leaders of the people who had elected Gopāla to the throne. There is no evidence in this inscription, or in any other, as far as we know, to support the view that these ministers had their power based in a constitutional sense on popular support or that they owed their allegiance or were responsible to any group of people or institution except the king.

As several generations of this Brahmin family were associated

12. Gauḍalekhamālā, p. 79 n.

with successive Pāla rulers, it is evident that the hereditary principle was observed in the appointment of ministers. This principle in regard to higher services at least appears to have continued to operate under later dynasties also, viz. the Candras and the Yādavas, as is shown by the Bhuvaneśvar *Praśasti* of Bhaṭṭa Bhavadeva.¹³ This inscription probably shows that Bhavadeva, an ancestor of Bhavadeva, served under a Candra king, and his son Govardhana may have also been connected with the same family. But Govardhana's son Bhaṭṭa Bhavadeva served under Harivarmadeva who appears to have been a member of the Yādava family of East Bengal.

Having made some concession for the fact that such statements regarding the honour and prestige enjoyed by these ministers at the hands of their sovereigns occur in an inscription where the panegyric element is too manifest to escape notice, one cannot but be persuaded to hold that there must be a substratum of truth in them, and on such a view of the matter, must attempt to explain what accounted for the dominant position held by these Brahmins in the royal court. One of the most apparent causes of their influence was their learning, which, to judge from the internal data of the Badal Pillar inscription, must have been of an outstanding character; another cause was their wealth which must have secured for them a large following, and the third factor what contributed to their success in the affairs of the state was their efficiency as soldiers. Garga, the adviser of Dharmapāla, was more than Br̥haspati, the counsellor and preceptor of the gods (*vijahāsa Br̥haspatim yaḥ*-verse 2); his son Darbhapāni appears to have been well-versed in the four Vedas (*Vidyā-catustaya-mukh-āmburūh-atta*...verse 4); Someśvara was like Dhanañjaya in point of prowess and he bestowed liberal gifts on suppliants and through his wealth was able to make his friends dance in joy (verse 3); Kedāramiśra was a great scholar having easily succeeded in acquainting himself with the four *vidyās* (verse 12) who seems to have given away large sums of money to needy persons, thinking that the wealth possessed by him really belonged to them, having been stolen by himself (*svayam-apahrta-vittam-arthino yo 'numene*-verse 14); Guravamiśra was a second Paraśurāma (verse 18); sovereign himself expressed his appreciation of his wealth of speech, his knowledge of the *Āgamas*, the *Vedas*, *Jyotiṣa* or Astronomy, etc. (verse 20); he was as much competent to defeat his opponents in assemblies of learned men as in overpowering his enemies in fields of battle (verse 22), however powerful they might be. His scholarship and sacrificial activities are spok-

13. Ep. Ind., VI, pp. 203-207; Inscr. of Beng., pp. 25 ff.

of with evident admiration in the Bhāgalpur inscription of Nārāyaṇa-pāla, where he is mentioned as doing the duties of a messenger (verse 18). Their intellectual qualities, no doubt gave them a commanding position which few rulers could ignore, but the Buddhist monarchs of the Pāla dynasty must have been specially concerned to pay them their homage on the very material ground that through them they could expect to keep the non-Buddhist element in the population in good humour. In the Kamauli *Praśasti* of Vaidyadeva, he is mentioned to have originally served as a *saciva* under the Gaudeśvara Kumārapāla (end of the 12th century). He is described in that inscription as the sharp-rayed sun unto the lotuses of the assembly of *sacivas* (verse 10)—*Saciva-samāja-saroja-tigma-bhānuḥ*. The nature of his duties and functions before his transfer to Assam is to be understood from the fact that he won a signal victory over the enemy in a naval battle in South Bengal and that the sovereignty of his master was a matter of deep and close concern to him (verses 11-12), which made him the latter's friend, dearer than his life. The functions of this officer must have been those of an intimate adviser or counsellor also qualified to back his efforts towards the success of his master's reign by rendering personal military service. Vaidyadeva was afterwards appointed to rule in the east in place of Timgyadeva who had become disaffected against Kumārapāla. It seems that in those days a minister who had no military qualities had little chance of being recognised by the government as indispensable. Vaidyadeva gave a further proof of his preeminence as a soldier by defeating Timgyadeva in battle, whereupon he was able to feel himself secure as a ruler in Kāmarūpa (*tam-avanipatiṁ jītvā yuddhe*—v. 14). The term *Mantri* is also found used in one of the Pāla inscriptions. The *dūta* of the grant recorded in the Bāngarh inscription of Mahīpāla I (10th century) was Vāmana, styled *Mantri*.

From the preceding discussions it will appear that the supreme position in the state belonged to the king who was advised and assisted by his sons, kinsmen and counsellors (*saciva*, *mantri*). For further details one should turn to those portions in the available inscriptions which supply designations of various officials to whom all grants of lands were to be communicated in a formal manner. The Khālimpur plate of Dharmapāla, which is the earliest dated record of his reign, gives a list of designations mentioned here in the order in which they occur in the text : *Rājarājanaka*, *Rājaputra*, *Rājāmatya*, *Senāpati*, *Viṣayapati*, *Bhogapati*, *Ṣaṣṭhādhikṛta*, *Dandaśakti*, *Dandapāsika*, *Cau-roddharanika*, *Daussādhasādhanika*, *Dūta*, *Khola*, *Gamāgamika*, *Abhivaramāṇa*, *Hasty-aśva-go-mahiṣ-ājāvik-ādhyakṣa*, *Nāvādhyakṣa*, *Balādhyakṣa*, *Tarika*, *Saulkika*, *Gaulmika*, *Tadāyuktaka*, *Viniyuktaka*.

In the undated Nālandā plate¹⁴ of the same king certain designations which do not occur in the above-mentioned inscription are found included in a similar list, viz. *Mahākārttākṛtika*, *Mahādaṇḍanāyaka*, *Mahāpratihāra*, *Mahāsāmanta*, *Mahārāja*, *Pramātr*, *Sarabhaṅga*, *Kumārāmātya*, *Rājasthānīya*, *Daśāparādhika*, *Uparika*, *Dāṇḍika*, *Kṣetrapāla*, *Prāntapāla*. A comparative study of the two lists will also show the omission of certain titles in the Nālandā plate, which are to be found in the Khālimpur Plate, viz. *Ṣaṣṭhādhikṛta*, *Daṇḍaśakti*, *Nāvā-dhyakṣa*, *Balādhyaṁkṣa*, *Bhogapati*, *Dūta*, *Khola*, *Senāpati*.

The lists given above begin with the designation Rājarājanaka. In the Munger grant of Devapāla the first designation mentioned is that of Rāṇaka. In the Bhāgalpur grant of Nārāyaṇapāla this is preceded by the word 'Rājā,' with which it seems to form a compound, implying a single office. In the Bāngarh and other later Pāla inscriptions this place is occupied by 'Rājarājanyaka' but the older form is Rājarājanaka, which occurs in the grants of Dharmapāla. It is thus to be noticed that while it is the grants of Devapāla only which begin with Rāṇaka, the other Pāla inscriptions begin either with Rājarājanka or Rājarājanyaka. In the Rāmpāl copper-plate of Śrī-Candra¹⁵ of the Candra dynasty the designation 'Rāṇaka' occurs next to 'Rājñī.' In the Belāva copper-plate¹⁶ of the Varmans and some inscriptions of the Senas (Barrackpur,¹⁷ Naihāti¹⁸ Ānuliā),¹⁹ both 'Rāṇaka' and 'Rājarājanyaka' are to be found, the latter standing at the head of the list while the former coming in after *Rājñī*. It has been suggested that the term 'Rājanaka' which occurs in the Camba inscriptions is a Sanskritised rather than a real Sanskrit word. This expression in Camba corresponded, as Vogel suggested,²⁰ to Rāṇā and was applied as a title to the vassals of its Rājās. The Rājatarāṅgiṇī quoted by him shows that the word Rājanaka used to be applied in Kaśmīr almost in the same sense as is denoted by the word 'minister.' If 'Rājanaka' is the same as 'Rāṇaka' or 'Rāṇā', how is it to be explained that both of them (Rāṇaka and either Rājanaka or Rājanyaka) occur together in some of the inscriptions? It may be that 'Rājanyaka' or its apparent corruption 'Rājanaka' is nothing but a diminutive form of 'Rājanya.' Regarding Rāṇaka, it is quite pos-

14. Ep. Ind., XXIII, pp. 290 ff.

15. Inscr. of Beng., pp. 1 ff.

16. Ep. Ind., XII, pp. 37-43; Inscr. of Beng., pp. 14 ff.

17. Ep. Ind., XIV, pp. 282 ff.; Inscr. of Beng., pp. 61 ff.

18. Ep. Ind., XIV, pp. 159 ff.

19. JASB, LVIX, Pl. I, pp. 62 ff.; Inscr. of Beng., pp. 85 ff.

20. Antiquities of Chamba, pp. 110, 121.

sible that the designation denoted some such status as is done by the word 'Rāṇā' in Chamba. That there was not probably a vast difference between the position of a Rājarājanaka and that of a Rāṇaka may be evident from the fact that the place of one appears to have been taken by the other in the grants of the Pālas. The Deopārā *Prasasti* of Vijayasena (12th century)²¹ was engraved by Śūlapāṇi, who was a Rāṇaka and the head of the guild of artisans of Varendra. If a king can write poetry, of which there are many instances in Indian history, there is nothing surprising in a prince engaging himself as an artist. But what is significant here is the headship of a guild, which must have been an economic organization, that is claimed for the Rāṇaka. It is probable that members of the princely order, sometimes foregoing political ambitions, preferred to win distinctions in other spheres of life.²²

The Rājāmātyas were probably the companions of the king, who were men of noble descent. An *amātya* may not have infrequently been employed as a royal adviser. In the absence of definite evidence it will be hazardous to attempt to indicate his position more precisely and how or whether his duties differed from those of *mantrins* and *sacivas*. The designation 'Rājāmātya' is to be understood in contradistinction from the term 'Kumārāmātya', the former apparently being used to denote a certain class of persons serving on the king's staff, while the latter a definite group of officers serving under the Kumāras.

The Senāpati was the highest military officer of the State, the commander-in-chief of the king's Army. The Nālandā grant does not mention this post but that of the *Mahādaṇḍanāyaka*, who probably performed duties similar to those of the Senāpati. The Irdā copperplate of the Kānboja king Nayapāla uses the term in the plural number. It is not improbable that the king was still regarded as the highest military authority in the state working with a number of Senāpatis. What is however most significant in connexion with the military department of the Kānboja King is a phrase in this inscription which definitely shows that the Senāpatis had to carry on their business with the help of a number of *Sainika-saṃgha-mukhyas* or chiefs of corporations of soldiers. It is interesting to note that the Kauṭīliya speaks

21. Ep. Ind., I, pp. 307 ff.

22. The Bihār Buddhist brass image inscription of the reign of Nārāyaṇapāla records a gift made by Rāṇaka Thāruka, a resident of Uḍaṇḍapur, see R. D. Banerji, Ind. Ant., XLVII, p. 110. The dūta of the grant recorded in the Ganjām Plate of Daṇḍimahādevī is a Rāṇaka named Dāṇālava, see Ep. Ind., vol. VI, pp. 137 ff.

of the Corporations of the Kāmbojas, the Surāṣṭras and the Kṣatriyas, devoted to trade and industry as well as to the practice of arms as a means livelihood (*Kāmbhoja-Surāṣṭra-Kṣatriya-śreṇy-ādayaḥ Vārt-tāsāśtropajīvinah*).²³ The Irdā grant may thus be regarded as incidentally furnishing a piece of valuable evidence about the identification of the Kāmbojas who established their political power in Bengal in the tenth century A.D. and also in regard to the continuity of their military institutions as late as that period. The *Śāsthādhikṛta* was in charge of the department entrusted with the work of collecting for the king one-sixth share of the produce from the cultivators. The title '*Daṇḍaśakti*' occurs only in the Khālimpur Plate. Its place in the list is taken by '*Dāṇḍika*' in the other inscriptions of the period, even in the Nālandā grant of Dharmapāla himself. Probably the same office is denoted by both the expressions. The *Daṇḍaśakti* appears to have been the officer in charge of the Law of Punishment. The *Daṇḍapāśika* of the Khālimpur and Nālandā plates of Dharmapāla must have filled the same office as that of the *Daṇḍavāsika* who appears in the other inscriptions. The expression is derived from 'daṇḍa-pāśa' i.e. 'rod and rope.' The form '*Daṇḍavāsika*,' according to Vogel²⁴, is due to 'vernacular influence'. The title describes rather crudely the functions of the Chief Police Officer. The *Cauroddharanika* was the highest officer concerned with the apprehension of thieves, robbers and brigands, his functions being the same as those of the *Cauroddhartā* or *Cauragrāha*, mentioned in the Hindu law-books.²⁵

It has been found difficult to understand the implications of the expression '*Dauhsādhasādhanika*' or its several variants, to be met with in all the inscriptions of the period. It is not clear if it sometimes refers to the functions of two different officers Dauhsādha and Sādhanika. The latter term can be traced in one of the Faridpur grants²⁶ by which some nautical officer may have been meant. The

23. XI. I. 160. It is difficult to agree with K. P. Jayaswal that the term *śreṇī* used here is the name of a particular republic like that of the Kāmbhojas etc., see his *Hindu Polity*, Pt. I, pp. 62. I am, however, inclined to think that the term Kṣatriya here used is a tribal name. Regarding the identification of the Kāmbhojas of the Kautiliya, See H. C. Raychaudhuri, *Political History*.

24. *Antiquities*, loc. cit, p. 129.

25. Jolly, *Hindu Law and Custom*, p. 271.

26. *Ind. Ant.*, 1910, p. 211 n. According to Pargiter, a Sādhanika was "some agent, attorney or factotum, appointed by the lord of the district to transact business generally on his behalf and that he was a person of higher authority

form *Dauhsādhyasādhanika* occurs in the Rāmpal grant of Śrī-Candra, *Dauhsādhanika* in the Belāva grant of the Varmans, and most of the Sena inscriptions, *Mahāduhsādhi* in the Edilpur grant of Keśava-sena and *Mahādauhsādhasādhanika* in the Pāla grants excepting the grants of the reign of Dharmapāla, where the expression is used without the prefix 'maltā'. It cannot be doubted that in most cases, if not in all, the duties and functions of a single officer are meant. The construction of the phrase makes it quite clear that whatever his actual work might have been, its extremely difficult or delicate character must have been its most prominent feature. The term is sometimes interpreted to mean the designation of an officer entrusted with the care of those who were mentally defective.²⁷

The Dūta held the post of an ambassador. The Irdā grant of the Kāmbōja King Nayapāla seems to show that a Dūta, who must have been employed as a representative of his sovereign at the Court of another king, was assisted by a number of *Gūḍha-puruṣas* (officers of the Secret service).²⁸ The designation was also used to mean the office of a messenger to which one was temporarily appointed for the purpose of communicating the king's sanction and order regarding a grant and getting it executed in the form of a legal document by local officers. The term '*Khola*' means in Sanskrit literature a lame person. What the functions of the officer designated *Khola* were have not yet been correctly ascertained. Among the Bengal inscriptions the title occurs in the Khālimpur grant, and curiously enough, once again in the Rāmganj inscription of the 13th century. The deriva-

than the officer who looked after the Vyāpāra," see *ibid.* pp. 212-213. Cf. "Kari-turag-oṣṭra-nausādhanika..." in the Sone East-Bank Copper-plate of Indradeva and Udayarāja, see Harit K. Deb, *Ep. Ind.*, XXIII, pp. 222 ff.

27. *Ep. Ind.*, XXIII. In the chapter dealing with the organisation of espionage in Kauṭliya's *Arthaśāstra*, the phrase *daṇḍakara-sādhanaḍhikāreṇa yā janapada-vidveṣam grāhayet* occurs. Shama Sastry's translation (see p. 27) seems to be defective, for it does not pay sufficient attention to the implications of '*adhikāreṇa*.' It may be possible that there was a department authorised to impose fines or oppressive taxes for the sole purpose of creating political troubles to the advantage of the king. '*Sādhayet*' is used in the *Arthaśāstra* in another passage (V, 6) in connexion with the task of tactically handling a disloyal chief (*āpat-pratikāreṇa yā sādhayet*). A *Sāadhanika* may be presumed to have been appointed to carry out difficult state business involving much personal risk.

28. There are two chapters in the Kauṭīliya, respectively entitled '*Gūḍha-puruṣ-otpattiḥ*' and '*Gūḍha-puruṣa-praṇidhi*' (I, 11-12) dealing with spies and the organisation of the department of espionage.

tive meaning of 'Gamāgamika' is 'one who goes and comes,' and that of 'Abhitvaramāṇa' 'one who hurries.' It may strike one that the officers designated by these titles could not have been of a high rank, since their functions, understood etymologically, merely carry with them a sense of physical efficiency and movement. But such a view cannot possibly be entertained as they have been grouped with those among whom the most responsible officers can be recognized. It is probable that the Gamāgamika was appointed to carry out functions of an urgent character in connexion with the diplomatic department of the State, requiring frequent visits to neighbouring kingdoms or to the dominions of vassals. The Abhitvaramāṇa's duty was probably to be actively responsible for an expeditious dispatch of official business of either some or all the departments of the State.

There were superintendents to deal with matters relating to different classes of animals, viz. elephant, horse, cow, buffalo (*Hasty-aśva-go-mahiṣ-ājāvikādhyakṣa*—Khālimpur Plate). The functions of this officer became more limited with the creation of another post concerned with the care and maintenance of those animals specially useful to the Army, viz. elephant, horse and Camel (Nālandā). The *Nāvādhyakṣa* and the *Balādhyakṣa* were the heads respectively of the department of navy and that of land forces. The term 'bala' in '*Balādhyakṣa*' may have the same sense as it bears in the expression '*hasty-aśva-oṣṭra-bala-vyāpṛtaka*.' It may be noted here that the latter phrase does not occur in the Khālimpur plate, as in the Nālanda plate of the same monarch it does occur with the omission of '*balādhyakṣa*.' It will however, be difficult to conclude from this that the functions of the two officers were the same, for part of the duties at any rate must have been carried out by the officer designated *Hasty-aśva-go-mahiṣ-ājāvik-ādhyakṣa*. There cannot be any doubt that this last named officer and the *Balādhyakṣa* employed by Dharmapāla carried out their work in mutual co-operation, the latter doing some additional duties in connexion with the management of Infantry. The military headship of the entire army must have belonged to the *Senāpati*. Among other duties of the *Nāvādhyakṣa* must have been those connected with the construction of *nav-vātakas* or bridges of boats which are frequently mentioned in the Pāla inscriptions as stretching across the Bhāgīrathī and other rivers of strategic importance, as well as their maintenance and upkeep. Navy played an important part in the military history of the Pālas and the Senas. There are references in the Kamauli grant of Vaidyadeva²⁹ and the commentary of the Rāmacarita to naval engagements or to crossings of rivers

29. Ep. Ind., II, pp. 350 ff,

by the Pāla Army, and in the Deopārā inscription of Vijayasena to a successful military undertaking during his reign involving the use of boats (*pāścātya-cakra-jayakeliṣu yasya yāvad-Gāṅga-pravāham-anu-dhāvati nau-vitāne*).

The term 'Tarika' means a ferryman, but the officer thus styled must have been more than a mere ferryman. The grants of Devapāla, contain two designations, *Tarika* and *Tarapati*, which seem to be allied in meaning. The *Tarika* appears to have been placed in charge of ferry service, probably a source of revenue,³⁰ and was besides responsible for carrying out those regulations which may have existed in regard to the movements of private individuals from one place to another. The *Tarapati* serving under Devapāla may have been responsible for the construction of ferries, their development and upkeep. The *Śaulkika* was the Superintendent of tolls or customs, and the *Gaulmika* performed the duties of the Superintendent of forests.

It should be pointed out here that in the Khālimpur grant there is no mention of 'Sāmantas' in its list of officials. In the other grants of the Pālas an officer styled *Mahāsāmanta* appears, including the Nālandā grant of Dharmapāla. The Khālimpur grant shows, however, the existence of this office by reporting that the gift recorded in that inscription was made at the request of the *Mahāsāmantādhipati*. Such an officer must have been appointed to exercise a general control over the feudatories; he was the link through which the king's contact with the Sāmantas was maintained. It may be suggested here that at least some of the Rāja-Rājanakas present at the king's court were a group of Sāmantas who used to spend most of their time at the imperial capital, with their military quotas placed at the disposal of their sovereign (*udicin-aneke-narapati-prābhṛtīkṛtāprameya-haya-vāhinī*—). The presence of many such subordinate rulers in the immediate neighbourhood of the king is alluded to in the passage: *dik-cakrayāta-bhūbhṛt-parikara-visarad-vāhinī-durvilo-kas-tasthau Śrī-Devapāla-nṛpatir-avasara-āpekṣayā dvāri yasya* (verse 6) occurring in the Garuḍa Pillar inscription of Bhaṭṭa Guravamiśra. The wives of such Sāmantas may have been referred to as Rājñīs in the lists of officials contained in our inscriptions. What arrangements these absentee lords made for the government of their own people are, however, not known. If these princely persons were really among those who are definitely known to have been officers of the Crown to whom every royal grant had to be communicated, it will appear that they along

30. See Kauṭīliya Arthaśāstra—II, 6 where the Samāharttā or Collector of revenue is asked to attend to *Sītā*, *bhāga*, *bali*, *kara*, *vanik*, *nadipāla*, *tara*, *pāvaḥ*, *paṭṭana*, *vivita*, *vartanī*, *rajjū*, *corarajjū*,

with the others had been drawn into the orbit of the central administration of the State. Another noteworthy point is that the king and his family together with probably certain ministers also appear to have been treated as a body entirely separated from the group of officers noted in these inscriptions. The king making a grant himself, it is true, need not be told about it, but members of the king's family including the Kumāras if any, the Yuvarāja, the queen or queens, should have been mentioned among those to whom such communications had to be made, had they not been regarded as a compact body distinct even from the highest officials of the State. Another noteworthy point is that the king and his family together with probably certain ministers also appear to have been treated as a body entirely separated from the group of officers noted in the inscriptions. Is it possible that the king with the responsible members of his family, his kinsmen and some prominent ministers also, formed a sort of inner chamber acting in close concert, isolating themselves from the aristocracy of officials? The Irdā copper-plate of the Kāmbojas, however, shows that their king treated himself as solely responsible for a grant and did not associate with his family or any one of the highest officials as is shown by the fact that the grant made by him to be communicated to the queen (*mahiṣī*), the crown-prince (*Yuvarāja*), the ministers (*mantrins*), the priest (*Purohita*), etc., in the first place, and secondly, to the *adhyakṣas* or departmental heads including the *Senāpati* with their staffs (*Karaṇas*).

The picture of the administrative condition of the early Pāla period, as can be framed on the evidence of the Khālimpur grant, of Dharmapāla, does not agree in every way with the one contained in the other inscriptions of the dynasty, including even the Nālandā copper-plate grant issued by the same monarch. The official designations to be found mentioned in his Nālandā grant are repeated with slight occasional changes in all the other records of this dynasty. Only in the Bhāgalpur grant of Nārāyaṇapāla the list given contains the additional designations: *Mahāsāndhivigrahiḥ*, *Mahākṣapaṭalika* and also *Rānaka*, besides *Rājarājanaka*. This list also omits *Tarapati* and compounds *Rājasthānīya* with *Uparika*. Moreover, in the Manahali grant of Madanapāla (12th century) there is no mention of *Mahādaṇḍanāyaka*. The term '*Amātya*' is occasionally replaced by the more explicit form *Rājāmātya*. The Bāngarh grant probably contains a reference to the post of *Mahāmantri*, but this is not to be found in the usual list of officers. Against the designation '*Hastyasūva-go-mahiṣ-ājāvik-ādhyakṣa*', to be noticed in the Khālimpur plate, as already mentioned, two designations are used in these grants including the Nālandā grant, viz. *Hastyasūva-oṣṭra-bala-vyāpṛtaka* and *Kiśora-vādava-*

go-mahiṣ-ājāvik-ādhyakṣa. Although the Nālandā grant is not dated, the similarity between its administrative portion and the lists of officers to be found in the records of the Pālas after Dharmapāla, makes it quite probable that this grant was issued later than the Khālimpur grant dated in the 32nd year of his reign. In all these grants, as already shown, some of the official designations are prefixed by 'Mahā'. Whether this addition is merely ornamental, or is to be taken as signifying a distinctive status superior to that of others who may have been given any such designation without the prefix, will remain a matter for speculation for the present, but it is quite possible that there was a tendency in the administrative system towards greater organization, further concentration of power, and unity of control, which manifested itself in the appointment of heads even among some of the highest ranks of officials.

(To be continued)

SOME ANCIENT INDIAN TRIBES

By BIMALA CHURN LAW

The Kuntalas are twice mentioned in the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa list of tribes, once in connection with the peoples of Kāśī and Kośala (lvii, 33), which means that they were a Madhyadeśa tribe, and elsewhere (lvii, 48) along with the Aśmakas, Bhogavardhanas, Naiṣikas, Andhras, etc., which suggests that they were a people of the Deccan. The Bhīṣmaparva of the Mahābhārata, however, seems to locate the people in three different regions. One verse (ix, 347) seems to locate them in the Madhyadeśa, while another (ix, 367) in the Deccan which is also upheld by a reference apparently to the same people in the Karṇaparva (xx, 779). A third reference in the Bhīṣmaparva (ix, 359) suggests location of the tribe somewhere in the western region. Cunningham suggests (A.S.R. xi, 123) that the country of the Kuntalas of the Madhyadeśa should be identified with the region near Chunar which he calls Kuntala. Whatever be the merit of the identification, the Kuntalas of the Madhyadeśa do not seem to have attained to any historical eminence. The Kuntalas of the west also have hardly any place in history. But the Kuntalas of the Deccan appear to have risen to considerable importance in historical times as will be evident from subsequent details.

Literary and epigraphic references have now proved beyond doubt that there were several families of the Śātakarṇis of the Deccan, and one or more of these families ruled over Kuntala of the Kanarese districts before the Kadambas (Rai Chaudhuri, PHAI, 4th edn. 339-40). One member mentioned in the Matsya Purāṇa list is actually called Kuntala Śātakarṇi, a name that is commented upon by the commentator of Vātsyāyana's Kāmasūtra. He takes the word "Kuntala" in the name Kuntala Śātakarṇi to mean "Kuntala-*viṣaye jātātāt tat-samākhyah*". A Śātavāhana of Kuntala is also referred to by the Kāvya-mīmāṃsā of Rājaśekhara. This king ordered the use of Prākṛit in exclusion of every other language by the ladies of his inner apartments. He has often been identified with king Hāla who hailed from Kuntala (Kāvya-mīmāṃsā notes, p. 9).

According to certain Mysore inscriptions (Rice, Mysore & Coorg from Inscriptions, p. 3; Fleet, Dynasties of the Kanarese districts, 284 f. n. 2), the Kuntala region included the southern part of the Bombay

Presidency and the northern portion of Mysore, and it was ruled at one time by the kings of the Nanda dynasty.

Kuntala figured in history also in later times. An Ajantā inscription credits the Vākāṭaka king Prthivīśena I with having conquered the lord of Kuntala. Another Vākāṭaka king Hariṣeṇa claimed victories over Kuntala along with Lāṭa, Avanti, Andhra, Kaliṅga etc.

The Vāṭadhānas are mentioned in the Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa, once

The along with the Vāhlikas, the Ābhīras, the Aparāntakas Vāṭadhānas and the Śūdras, all grouped in the North-west (lvii, 36), and at another place, along with the Śiviḍas, Dāserakas, Śavadhānas, Puṣkalas, Kairātas etc, all grouped as peoples of the North (lvii, 44). The Vāyu Purāṇa, erroneously no doubt, reads Vāḍhadhānas (xlv, 115).

That they were a Punjab tribe is also borne out by the evidence of the Mahābhārata. There the Vāṭadhānas are said to be derived from an eponymous king Vāṭadhāna who belonged to the same *Krodhavaśa* group as the eponymous kings of the Vāhlikas, Madras and Sauviras (Ādiparva, lxvii, 2695-9). The Sabhāparva locates their country in the western region (xxx, 1190-91), and the Udyogaparva seems to suggest that they joined the side of the Kurus in the great Bhārata war (xviii, 569-601). The people are mentioned elsewhere in the epics as well, e.g. Sabhāparva, i, 1826 ; Udyogaparva, iii, 86 ; Bhīṣmaparva, ix, 354 and Droṇaparva, xi, 398. Vāṭadhāna-dvijas were amongst those who were conquered by Nakula (Sabhāparva, xxxi, 1190-1).

According to Manu, Vāṭadhāna was the offspring of an out-caste Brāhmaṇa woman (x, 21), but Pargiter points out that this "is no doubt an expression of the same arrogance which in later times stigmatised all the Punjab races as out-castes (Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa, p. 312 notes).

The Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa list mentions the Ātreyas along with the Bharadvājas, Puṣkalas, Kuśerukas, Lampākas etc. The as peoples of the North (lvii, 39-40). The Matsya Purāṇa reads Atris who are undoubtedly the same as the Ātreyas (cxiii, 43).

The Ātreyas are also mentioned in several places in the Mahābhārata. They are represented as a family of Brāhmaṇas dwelling in the Dvaitavana (Vana P. xxvi, 971) not far from the Sarasvatī (Vana P. clxxvii, 12354-62). They are also mentioned in the Bhīṣmaparva list (ix, 376), and the Harivaṃśa seems to suggest that the people originated from the ṛṣi Prabhākara of Atri's race (xxx, 1660-68) whence came the name of the tribe Ātreya.

They were evidently the people of Śūrparaka. The Mārkaṇḍeya The Śūrparakas list (lvii, 49) reads Sūryarakas which is evidently a mis-

take, but all the Purāṇas agree in placing them in the west where lived the celebrated sage Rāma Jāmadagnya (Mbh. Vana P. lxxxv, 8185). But the Mahābhārata also locates them in the South (Sabhā P. xxx, 1169; Vana P. lxxxviii, 8337) because it bordered on the Southern Sea in the western region (Śānti P. xlix, 1778-82). The region situated near Prabhāsa (Vana P. cxviii, 10221-7) included the country around the mouth of the Narmadā (Anuśāsana P. xxv, 1736). It was the sage Rāma Jāmadagnya who is credited with having built the city of Śūrpāraka (Hari V. xcvi, 50).

Śūrpāraka is mentioned in one of the inscriptions of Śaka Uṣavādāta and is undoubtedly the same as Suppāraka of Pali literature where it is described as a great sea-coast emporium identified with Sopārā of early Greek geographers.

The Purāṇas make a mess in the mention of this people. The Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa in one context reads it as Naiṣikas (lvii, 48), but in the same canto in another context reads it as Nāsikyāvas (lvii, 51), and still in another place correctly as Nāsikyas (lviii, 24). There is no doubt that one and the same people of ancient Nasik is meant. The Vāyupurāṇa reads Nairṇikas (xlv. 127) where Mārkaṇḍeya reads Naiṣikas, and instead of Nāsikyāvas of the same source, it reads Nāsikyas. The Matsya-purāṇa reads Vāsikas (cxiii, 50). This confusion makes it evident that the people and the region were not so widely celebrated. This people moreover does not seem to have been known to the authors of the Epics.

What is true of the Ātreyas seems to be equally true of the Bharadvājas or Bhāradvājas. The Mārkaṇḍeya list (lvii. 39-40) mentions the tribe along with the Ātreyas, Puṣkalas, Lampākas etc. and locates them in the North. They are also mentioned in the Bhīṣmaparva list (IX, 376) in the same context as that of the Ātreyas; the Great Epic tradition connects Bhāradvāja with the upper Gangetic region near the hills (Ādip. cxxx, 5102-6; clxvi, 6328-32; Vanap. cxxxv, 10700-728; Śalya p. xlix, 2762-2824), and Bhāradvāja, the ṛṣi was evidently the originator of the race or tribe. Like the Ātreyas, it is tempting to connect the people of various caste divisions of present-day India claiming to belong to the Bhāradvāja gotra with the Bhāradvāja tribe.

The Lampākas are mentioned in the Mārkaṇḍeya list (lvii 40) along with the Kuśerukas, Śulakāras, the Culikas, Jāgudās etc. as a people of the North. The Matsya Purāṇa reads (cxiii, 43) Lampakas instead, which is no doubt wrong. The Mahābhārata (Droṇa p. cxxi, 4846-7) also mentions the tribe and seems to suggest that they were a rude mountain tribe like the Daradas and Pulindas. Long ago Cunningham identified the

region of the Lampākas with modern Lamghan, hundred miles to the east of Kapisene, north-east of Kabul which practically upholds Lassen's identification of the place with Lambagae, south of the Hindukush in modern Kafiristhan.

If the tradition contained in Hemacandra's *Abhidhāna-Cintāmaṇi* is to be believed, then Lampāka seems to have once been the centre of the Sai-wang or the Śaka-Muraṇḍa people (*Lampākāstu Muraṇḍah syuh*).

The Arbudas must have been the people dwelling on and around the Arbuda mountain which is generally identified with modern Mt. Abu which is the southern end of the Aravalli hills.

The Khasas are described in one place of the *Mārkaṇḍeya Purāṇa* (lvii, 56) as "parvataśrayiṇah" or dwelling along the mountains, and in another place as located in the middle of the tortoise along with the Śālvas, Nīpas, Śakas, Śūrasenas etc. (lviii, 6). Epic tradition as contained in the *Mahābhārata* brands them as a rude half-civilised tribe along with the Śakas, Daradas etc. (*Sabhā* p. li, 1859), while the *Harivaṃśa* records the reason why they were considered as such. It says that the people were once defeated and degraded by King Sagara (xiv, 784) and were hence regarded as mlecchas (xcv, 6440-41). *Manu* also says that they were originally Kṣatriyas, but were later on degraded by the loss of sacred rites and the absence of brāhmaṇas in their midst (x, 43-44). The *Sabhāparva* of the *Mahābhārata* places the people near the river Śailoda between the Meru and Mandāra mountains (li, 1858-9). If the river Śailoda is the same as Śailodaka of the *Matsya Purāṇa* (cxx. 19-23), then the Khasas seem to have originally settled somewhere in Tibet or further north-west. Much later, in historical times, the Khasas are mentioned with some other tribes in the inscriptions of the Pālas and Senas of Bengal in such a way as to suggest that they enlisted themselves as mercenary troops in the army of the kings of those dynasties.

NANA, THE MOTHER GODDESS IN INDIA AND WESTERN ASIA

By BAIJNATH PURI

The representation of the Goddess *NANA* or *NANAIA* on the Kuṣāṇa coins has baffled the numismatists even to this day. All of them thought that the Goddess on account of her peculiar name was either a Greek or a Zoroastrian Goddess. Sir Aurel Stein, who was the first to throw some light on this topic remarked in his paper as follows : "In the ranks of Zoroastrian deities, the Goddess *NANA* very frequent on the coins of all Turukṣa kings, cannot fairly claim a place. Although her cult is found in various localities of Iran, as over a large part of Western Asia, there can be little doubt as to her non-Iranian origin. She was certainly never recognized by the Zoroastrian church and a few instances of her amalgamation with the Avestic Anāhitā in the west and in a syncretistic age are by no means sufficient to prove that her worship in Indo-Scythia was in any way connected with Zoroastrian cult. It evidently preceded and outlasted the latter. Her name is found on the coins of an earlier king, who makes use of the type of Eucratides and it still occupies a prominent place on those of Vāsudēva from which all the Zoroastrian types have already disappeared." (I.A. 1888 p. 98).

From the above account it appears that *NANA* did not belong to the Zoroastrian pantheon. This is confirmed by the fact that she continued to appear on the coins of Vāsudeva who certainly had no Zoroastrian type in his coins. Therefore she does not appear to be an Iranian Goddess and we shall have to find out her identity somewhere else. In this connection we have to notice a type of Huviṣka's coin where the Goddess *NANA* and the God *OHPO* appear facing each other. This type was previously noticed by Sir Alexander Cunningham (C.C.P.M. p. 207, No. viii.) and also by Whitehead (C.C.P.M. p. 197, No. 135) but none of them discussed the significance of it. It therefore remained a mystery. *OHPO* was however identified by Prof. D. R. Bhandarkar with Umeśa or Lord Śiva (Carmichael Lectures, 1921 p. 17). This identification was perfectly correct because of the presence of Nandī along with *OHPO* who also holds the trident. Now the question naturally arises : who could be this Goddess *NANA* who is fit to be associated with Śiva ? It first appeared to me that this Goddess *NANA* was Durgā because

on one coin of Sapaleizes the name *NANAIA* is associated with a Lion (Whitehead, p. 168). Again, in a type of coin of Huviška she is portrayed as holding a sword at waist and a sceptre and patera (Gardner p. 146 No. 84). I discussed the matter with Dr. Bhandarkar to whom this interpretation was not acceptable for the simple reason that *NANA* or *NANAIA* and Durgā do not have any correspondence in sound. He however referred me to the word *NANĀ* in the Vedic Sanskrit Lexicon where it means "a mother," e.g. in the Rgveda (IX. 112.3) we have a verse : **कारुहं ततो भिषगुपलप्रक्षिणी नना** meaning 'A bard am I, my father a physician, my mother a grinder (of corn) on stone' (See Madras Lectures of Prof. Bhandarkar 1938-39, p. 16).

Now in the Rgveda there is another word expressing the sense of 'mother' namely *ambā* or *ambitamā*. Thus the Goddess Ambā or Ambikā was a Mother Goddess in the Rgvedic period. Her association with Rudra, as pointed out by Dr. Bhandarkar, is clear from a reference in the Vājasaneyi-Saṁhitā (III. 58) where she is mentioned as the Sister of Rudra (III. 58). The mythological association of the Goddess Ambikā with Śiva has however varied at different periods. In the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa (II. 6.2.9) Ambikā is mentioned as the sister of Śiva. But in later periods Ambikā is mentioned in a different relation to Śiva. In the Amarakoṣa there is a śloka :

शिवा भवानी रुद्राणी शर्वाणी सर्वमङ्गला ॥

अपर्णा पार्वती दुर्गा मृडानी चण्डिकाम्बिका ॥ (I. 37-38) .

The position of Ambikā is further explained as **अम्बिका पार्वती-मात्रोर्ध्वतराष्ट्रस्य मातरि**" Here she is taken in three senses, viz. as the name of Pārvaī, as mother, and as mother of Dhṛtarāṣṭra. In this case her relation with Śiva would be that of wife. Howsoever the mythological conception developed itself later on, her original association with Rudra as Sister, and Ambā of the world, that is, Mother Goddess, remains incontrovertible, and seems to have continued right up to the time of Huviška, because, as mentioned above, *NANĀ* (=Ambā) is associated with OHPO=Umeśa=Husband of Umā. Further as was first pointed out also by Dr. Bhandarkar, Umā occurs on a coin of the Kuṣāṇa sovereign showing clearly that Umā and Nanā did not come to be identified up till his time.

Thus it is clear that *NANĀ* in the Vedic Sanskrit language meant 'a mother' which meaning was also applicable to Ambā or Ambitamā and therefore the goddess NANA was none else than the goddess Ambā who is mentioned as the Mother Goddess in the Rgveda and whose

association, with Rudra in whatever capacity it may be, is clear from Vedic Literature.

A question which now arises is whether the iconographical conception of *NANA* as indicated on the coins can be identified with the iconographical conception of Ambikā. According to the Hindu Iconography Ambikā is seated upon a Lion and has three eyes. She has in one left hand a mirror. Her one right hand is held in the *Varada* pose. In the other two hands she holds the sword and shield (T. Gopināth Rao : Hindu Icon. Vol. I, Pt. II, p. 358). Now we have already seen that on one coin of Sapaleizes *NANAIA* appears along with a Lion and the name of the Goddess alone shows that before the Kuṣāṇas she was represented with the *Vāhana* which came to be closely associated with her in later times.

Our investigation into the the *NANA-AMBĀ* cult will be incomplete unless we take into account what figure the goddess cut in the West. In this connection the following remarks of Jasrow are very important : "The oldest cult of the Mother-Goddess, so far as our material goes, appears indeed to have been in Uruk where she is known as *NA-NA* but we may be quite sure that the cult was never limited to one place. The special place which *NANA* has in the old Babylonian pantheon is probably due to the peculiar development taken by the chief deity of that centre, Anu, who as we have seen before, became an abstraction, the God of Heaven presiding over the upper realm of the universe. Her temple at Uruk known as *E-anna* 'the heavenly house' and revealing the association of the goddess with Anu as a solar deity became one of the most famous in Euphrates Valley. It is in connection with the cult of Nana that we learn of a phase of the worship of the Mother Goddess which degenerates into the obscene rites that call forth amazement of Herodotus (Book I. § 199). As the Mother-Goddess *NANA* or Ishtar is not only the source of fertility displayed by the earth and the kind gracious mother of mankind, but also the goddess of love, the Aphroditic of Babylonia. The mysterious process of conception and the growth of embryo in the mother's womb gave rise at an earlier period to rites in connection with the cult of the Mother-Goddess that symbolised the fructification through the combination with the male element" (The Civilization of Babylonia and Assyria, p. 233).

The views expressed above by Jastrow fit most excellently in the case of *NANA-AMBĀ* cult of India. In this country she was associated with Rudra who in the Kuṣāṇa period became known as *OHPO=Umeśa*. Here also the worship of the Mother-Goddess has degenerated into obscene rites. She is looked upon not only as the source of fertility but also as Bhavānī i.e. the wife of the God of pro-

creation. It is therefore no wonder if what happened at Uruk in the case of *NANA* happened also in India in the case of practically the same Goddess *NANA-AMBĀ*. I have discussed all these details with Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar who on the whole agrees with me in my conclusions and wonders how this point of view did not suggest itself to the erudite writers who have made valuable contributions to the classical volumes of *Mohenjo-daro and the Indus Civilization* and who are conversant with Egyptology and Assyriology.

GERMANIC AND SANSKRIT*

By BATAKRISHNA GHOSH

No nation, at its first appearance on the stage of history, received such a glorious accueil as the Germans, for no less a person than Julius Caesar has left us in the chronicle of his Gallic wars the earliest description of the Germanic tribes and their manners and customs. Towards the end of the first century A.D., Cornelius Tacitus wrote his famous book *Germania*, which is the first social history of the Germans, written by an admiring foreigner. Germany has changed much since the days of Tacitus, but the Germans have on the whole retained to the present day those qualities, which, even without the veneer of civilisation to set them off, so powerfully impressed the culture-worn statesmen of the antique world. The Roman imperialists of the post-Christian era were living on the credit of their fathers. They bought over and harnessed to their service the brains of the Greeks and the brawn of German mercenaries, and thus managed to stagger on for a few centuries longer. They even constructed fortifications along their frontiers to keep out the barbarian hordes. But nothing was of any avail. In the fifth Century the flickering flame of antique civilisation was finally extinguished when Rome was permanently occupied by the Germans. The Dark Age now set in.

It is curious to think in the retrospect that the only power which profited by the gloom and obscurity of the Dark Age was the Christian Church. Taking full advantage of the general bewilderment following the cataclysm, the Christians tirelessly preached that the end of the world was near. They preached that in times such as these the pursuit of arts was futile, and the only thing that counted was the grace of God, of which the monopoly was held by the Christian Church. The success of this persistent propaganda in the demoralised world of the day was immense, and the whole of Europe was Christianised within a few centuries. But almost all the converted Europeans were uncivilised, and the fierce German and Germanic princes who in the Middle Ages ruled all the countries from Syria to England, were in truth mere tools in the hands of the astute cardinals of Rome. The Church dignitaries no longer allowed themselves to be bothered by the noble ideals of the early

* Students who might care to read this paper are expected to have first read my "Linguistic Introduction to Sanskrit" (LIS.)--To avoid confusion, length of Germanic vowels has been throughout indicated by bar above.

Christians, and in their unholy zeal to establish the supremacy of the Church over the State, they adopted the policy of "divide and rule"—the basic maxim of the impotent imperialism of the later Romans. For a thousand years Europe was ravaged by wars of religious communalism, the chief responsibility for which must be laid at the door of the greedy Christian Church. The greedy Church soon threw away all semblance of decency and opened a vast monopoly trade in indulgences, and actually issued indulgence-bonds after the fashion of modern joint-stock companies. Sometimes these bonds were floated through the leading banking houses of the day like the Fuggers, the Rothschilds of the Middle Ages. A more depraved condition of a Church can be hardly imagined. It was all the more deplorable, because in spite of all its imperfections the Church was the only organisation in the Middle Ages within which the arts of peace could still be cultivated. The overthrow of this utterly corrupt and all-powerful Church was therefore absolutely necessary if the European civilisation was to be saved: This was achieved, again, by the Germans, led by Martin Luther, who is also the maker of the modern German language!

European history from the beginning of the Christian era to the present day is but a long sad story of frustrated efforts to achieve a synthesis between the fine but self-centred Graeco-Roman culture rating wit higher than wisdom, and the emotional individualism of the Germans, always straining for the intangible, often defeated, but never daunted by suffering. In disappointment and despair, and in the earlier days out of sheer ignorance, the Germans destroyed much of the heritage of older cultures; but they also broadened the basis of civilisation as a whole. Germany has produced the greatest philosophers and musicians of modern Europe, and if the world has ever seen a man of perfect culture it must have been in the person of the German poet Goethe. Such were, and still are, the Germans, whose languages we shall try to describe in this chapter.

As in the case of Greek, so in the case of Germanic too, we shall have to start with a large number of dialects, some of which, such as English, Dutch, Danish etc., have gained the status of independent languages. Primitive Germanic is merely a construction of the linguists.

The Germanic dialects are divided primarily into three groups: Nordic, Eastern Germanic, and Western Germanic. Of the Eastern Germanic dialects only Gothic—more precisely, the dialect of the western Goths—is known to us from the Bible-translation of Ulfilas (4th century A.D.). This solitary literary monument in Gothic is however of the highest importance for Germanic philology, for Gothic is the oldest Germanic dialect that we know. Gepides, Vandals, Burgundians and other Eastern Germanic tribes are well known in history, but they have left no literary monument behind. The dialects of the

Scandinavian Countries and Iceland are called Nordic, and the dialects of the tribes who occupied the territory corresponding roughly to modern Germany, Switzerland, Holland and England together constitute the group called Western Germanic.

Nordic however is characterised by at least one striking linguistic innovation common with Eastern Germanic, and each of these two groups has preserved a number of primitive characteristics which Western Germanic has given up. On these grounds it is sometimes claimed that Nordic and Eastern Germanic should be considered as one group. Whatever that may be, the linguistic innovation common to Nordic and Eastern Germanic is very striking: in both these groups primitive Germanic *zu* changes into *ggu*; thus Goth. *triggws*, O. Norse *tryggr*: O.H.G. *ga-triuui*. Similarly, primitive Germanic *zl* develops into *ggj* in Old Norse, but Gothic here leaves us in the lurch and shows *ddj* instead; thus Goth. *twaddjē*, O.N. *tveggja*: O.H.G. *zweiio*. On the other hand, on an equally important point, Nordic differs from Gothic and agrees with Western Germanic, for Gothic does not change I.-E. *ē* into *ā* like Nordic and Western Germanic.—Before dealing with the old Germanic languages as a whole from the view-point of Indo-European linguistics we shall have to describe the chief characteristics of the dialects of these three groups, and we shall begin with Eastern Germanic represented by Gothic alone.

I.-E. *e* and *i* appear as *i* in stressed syllable in Gothic, but as *e* (written *ai*) before *r*, *h* and *hw*; cf. *itan* (Skt. *ad-*), *sitan* (Skt. *sad-*), *wigan* (Skt. *vah-*), *witan* (Skt. *vid-*), *widuwō* (Skt. *vidhāvā*), but *bairan* (Skt. *bhar-*), *saihan* (Skt. *sat-*), etc. Similarly, the alternance between *u* and *o* (written *au*) in the stressed syllable is not determined by the quality of the vowel of the following syllable as in Nordic and Western Germanic, but is due simply to the opening of *u* before *r* and *h*. This will be clear from these participial forms: *bairans*, *tauhsans* but *numans*, *gutans*. In unstressed syllable however *i* and *u* may stand before *h* (cf. *parihis*, and the enclitic particle *-uh*). I.-E. *e* becomes *a* before *r* in unstressed syllable (cf. *lukarn* from Lat. *lucerna*, *fadar*—O.H.G. *fater*). Gothic *ē* and *ō* are closed sounds approaching *ī* and *ū*. Hence the primitive Germanic open *ē*, which has become *ā* in Nordic and Western Germanic, has in Gothic coincided with the original closed *ē* to which corresponds *ē* (O.H.G. *ea*, *ia*) in Nordic and Western Germanic. Syncope of short vowels in unstressed syllables has taken place in Gothic in a peculiar fashion. As a rule, only final syllables have been affected by this rule of syncope which takes place not only in open syllable as in Western Germanic, but also before *s*, *z*. But the vowel *u* is not affected by it. Thus Nom. Sg. *sunus* but *dags* < **dagaz* < **da goz*, *gasts* < **gastiz*. Similarly Acc. Sg. *dag* < **da ga(m)*, *gast* < **gasti(m)* but *sunu*. The common-Germanic shortening of the long final vowels *ī*, *ū*, *ō* took place in

Gothic *after* this syncope of short vowels, but in Nordic and Western Germanic it took place *before* it. In unstressed syllables Gothic shows an *a* where Nordic and Western Germanic show a high vowel; thus as the result of the common-Germanic shortening of final *ō*, we have, for instance, Goth. *giba* ("gift") but Ags. *ziefu*; Goth. *giba* ("I give") but O.H.G. *gibu*. Original short *ō* appears before *m* in Nordic and Western Germanic as *u*, but in Gothic as *a*; cf. Dat. Pl.: Goth. *dagam*, O.H.G. *tagum*, O. Norse *dagum* (*o*=*aw* in English *saw*).

Final primitive Germanic *z* has become *s* in Gothic, but this secondary surd sibilant reverts to the original sonant when immediately followed by the enclitic particle *-u* or *-uh*; thus *ains* but *ainz-u*, *hvas* but *haz-uh*. In the same way, *b* *d* become *f* *þ* after final vowel (cf. Imp. *gif* from *giban*, *hláifs*—*hláibōs*, *biuda*—*báuþ*, *staþs*—*stadis*). Where *w* due to the disappearance of the following vowel came to be final or confronted to *s*, it formed a diphthong with the preceding short vowel; thus from *kniw* "knee" (< **knewa*) the genitive form *kniwis*, and from *fāus* "few" (< **fawaz*) the plural form *fawdi*. After long vowels or diphthongs, however, and after consonants, the *w* remains unchanged*, thus *sāiws* "sea", *waiurstw* "work."

Through analogy, the effects of grammatical alternance have been largely obliterated in Gothic. It is the consonants of the present that have been generalised in most cases. Thus Goth. *teiha*, *taih*—*taihum*, *taihans*, but O.H.G. *zihu*, *zēh*—*zigum*, *gazigan*. The vowel-element *ai* of every reduplication-syllable is another peculiarity of Gothic. It is usually considered to be due to the analogical influence of forms like *haihait*, *rairēþ* in which the *ai* of the reduplication-syllable is phonologically regular (but see Streitberg, § 49). Preterital forms with the dental suffix but without the connecting vowel are quite rare in Gothic; thus O. Norse *sōtta*, O.H.G. *forahta* (< **sōhta*, **faurhta*) but Goth. *sōkida* "I sought", *faurhtida* "I feared."

In declension, the genitive plural ends mostly in *-e* in Gothic, but the corresponding forms in Nordic and Western Germanic point to *-ō*. The dative sing. masc. and neut. of pronouns and adjectives ended in *-ē* in Gothic as in *hammēh* < *hammē-uh* before the shortening of final vowel, but the *u* of the corresponding O.H.G. form *huēmu* is derived from an *-ō*. In dative sing. of *ā*-declension Goth. has *gibái*, but O.H.G. *gēbu* and O. Norse *gjǫf* < **gēþō*; in gen. and dat. sing. of *i*-declension Goth. *anstáis* *anstái*, but O.H.G. *ensti*; in dative sing. of *u*-declension Goth. *sundú* but O.H.G. *suniu*, O. Norse *syni*.—Vocalisation of consonantal declension has on the whole gone further in Gothic than in Old Norse or Old English; in some cases the vowel thus joined to consonantal stem was *u*, cf. *fōtus* "foot."

* It is possible that in these cases *w* was a spirant,

Nordic literature is not so old as Gothic, but there are Runic inscriptions in Nordic which go back to 300 A.D. Nordic loan-words in Finnish and Lappish are also important for the history of the Nordic languages. Runic Nordic is in some respects more archaic than Gothic, for there the vowels of final syllables, which have disappeared in Gothic, are still preserved; thus *ḍagaR*, *gastiR*, *horna*=Goth. *dags*, *gasts*, *hairn*. But the chief characteristics of Nordic are still wanting in the language of the earliest runic inscriptions. The language developed its specifically Nordic character only after 700 A.D. when the Vikings began their meteoric career of conquest. But the seeds of dialectical differentiation were already there. Western Nordic comprehends the dialects of Norway, the Faroe-islands, and Iceland, and it was spoken also in England in the Middle Ages. Western Nordic literature goes back to the second half of the twelfth century, and it was in full bloom from the thirteenth to the fifteenth century. An idea of this noble literature can be formed from the novels of Sigrid Undset. The language of this Old Norwegian and Old Icelandic literature is called Old Norse, and it has had an uninterrupted and natural development in Iceland. Eastern Nordic on the other hand, from which have sprung up modern Swedish and Danish, is known to us from a pretty large number of runic inscriptions, but manuscript-texts in the language are not older than the thirteenth century.

Assimilation of various sound-combinations is one of the chief characteristics of Old Norse. Besides the *i*-umlaut it is moreover characterised by an *u*-umlaut which may be caused also by consonantal *v*. Through this *u*-umlaut *a* becomes *ø* (an open *o*) and *i* becomes *y* (i.e. *ü* in pronunciation); thus *søk* < **saku*, *ṭørn* < **barnu*, *ṭlom*=O.H.G. *āzum*, *syngva*=Goth. *siggwan*. Another peculiar sound of Old Norse is *ø* (something like modern German *ö*) originated from *a* through *i*- and *u*-umlaut, cf. *søkkva*=Goth. *sagqjan*† "to sink."—Nasals are assimilated to the following surd occlusives, thus *drekka* "to drink," *vetr* (< **vettr*) "winter"; *l* > *ḥll* and *nḥ* > *nn*: cf. *gull*=Goth. *gulḥ*, *finna*=Goth. *finḥan*. The *r* < *z* < *s* is assimilated to preceding *l*, *n*, *s*; cf. *heill*=Goth. *hāils*, *steinn*=Goth. *stāins*. The combination *ht* becomes *tt*, the vowel preceding it being lengthened, thus *mätta*=Goth. *mahta*. The final nasal, or the nasal which secondarily becomes final, is dropped, thus in infinitives (like *binda* etc.) and in acc. pl. (*daga*, *gesti*=Goth. *dagans*, *gastins*). Only monosyllabic words get compensatory lengthening when the final nasal is dropped in this way, thus *ī* from *in* and *ā* from *an*. Due to a very strong expiratory initial accent, not only final syllables, but also medial syllables have undergone

† It should be noted that after the fashion of the Greeks the Goths too used to represent the guttural nasal by *g*.

contraction in Old Norse, and that in a much larger measure than in Gothic or Western Germanic. The formation of a medio-passive by joining the reflexive-pronoun to verb-forms is another peculiar feature of Old Norse.

We now come to the most important group of Germanic languages—Western Germanic, which includes English, Friesian, Low Saxon, Low Frankish§—and the various dialects of Germany proper which are together called High German. The High German dialects are divided into three periods—old (750-1100 A.D.), middle (1100-1500 A.D.) and new (1500—). Anything like a full discussion of all these various Western Germanic dialects will not be possible here. We shall have to content ourselves only with pointing out the chief peculiarities of the principal Western Germanic dialects of the oldest period, so that by comparing various cognate Germanic forms we may be able to reconstruct the corresponding forms of primitive Germanic—which to connect with Sanskrit through the original Indo-European is our chief purpose here. For this purpose we shall at first discuss the chief distinguishing features of each of the principal Western Germanic dialects, and then the peculiar features of the Western Germanic dialects as a whole distinguishing them from Eastern and Northern Germanic.

Of the various Germanic tribes who left the parent soil and settled down in other countries only, the forefathers of the English had retained and further developed their original language. But Old English was not a homogeneous dialect—for the simple reason that the Germans (the Angles, Saxons and Jutes) who came to England in the fifth century were from different parts of the Germanic area on the North Sea coast. The Jutes however could not have been connected with the Scandinavians later inhabiting the whole of Jutland, and neither the Saxons with the later important tribe of the same name in Lower Germany. The Saxons who invaded England were very probably the Saxones of the antique writers. The dialects of these three peoples, though differing from each other in details, were on the whole of a homogeneous character, and of the continental dialects Friesian stood nearest to them. The Anglo-Saxon dialects and Friesian have moreover in common a number of striking innovations. Thus Western Germanic *a* in closed syllable has as a rule become *æ* in them (Ags. *fæt*, O. Fries. *fet*); but before nasal this *a* assumed an intermediate quality, expressed sometimes by *o* and sometimes by *a* (*man—mon*). Similarly Western Germ. *ā*=prim. Germ. *ē* is rounded before nasal (cf. Ags. *mōna*, O. Fries. *mōna*=O.H.G. *māno* "moon"), but otherwise becomes *æ* and *ē* respectively in these two dialects (cf. Ags. *slæpan*, O. Fries. *slēpa*=O.H.G. *slāfan*). The *ā* from *añ* appears in them as *ō*, which may be further shortened

§ These are called Low German dialects.

into *ǝ* (cf. Ags.—O. Fries. *brǝhte* = Goth.—O.H.G. *brāhta*). In unstressed syllables Western Germanic *o* becomes *a* (Ags.—O. Fries. *fana* : O.H.G. *fano* “banner”) and *a* becomes *e* (Ags.—O. Fries. *tunge* : O.H.G. *zunga* ; Ags. *ēaȝe*, O. Fries. *āȝe* : O.H.G. *auga*).†

Apart from these innovations common with Friesian, Anglo-Saxon shows some other peculiarities which distinguish it from the other Western Germanic dialects including Friesian. Thus Germanic *ai* appears as *ā* (cf. Ags. *ān* : Goth. *ains*, O.H.G. *ein*) and Germanic *au* appears as *ēa* (cf. Ags. *ēaȝe* : Goth. *augō*, O.H.G. *auga*), and Germanic *eu* as *ēo* (cf. Ags. *lēof* : Goth. *liufs*, O.H.G. *leob*). A very prominent characteristic of Anglo-Saxon is the so-called “breaking” of simple vowels into diphthongs through the influence of following consonants (viz. *h* or *r*, *l*, *h*+consonant); thus Ags. *seah* (from *sēon*) : O. Sax. *sah* ; Ags. *heorte* : Goth. *hairtō*, O.H.G. *hērza* (*ē* is an open *e*); Ags. *meolcan* : O.H.G. *mēlkan* ; Ags. *eahta* : O.H.G. *ahto*. The *i*-umlaut took place at a very early date in Anglo-Saxon, and that even in those cases where the *i* was lost through the common Western Germanic vowel-drop.—After the Anglo-Saxons had settled down in England, practically exterminating the original Celtic inhabitants of the island who have left surprisingly few traces on the English language, England was subjected to fresh invasions by Germanic tribes,—the Scandinavians, who occupied chiefly the northern provinces. The influence of these Scandinavian invaders on the English language, though not inconsiderable, is however as nothing compared with that exercised by the Franco-Normans whose dialect was the court-language of England for several centuries. The result was that Anglo-Saxon became a peasants’ dialect. But it was a blessing in disguise, for the peasant guardians of the language unconsciously simplified it a great deal. This is at least one of the causes of the popularity of the English language at the present day.—It may be mentioned in passing that of modern Germanic languages Dutch too, like English, is one of those dialects of the Western Germanic group which have eluded the second Germanic sound-shift. The same is the case also with Old Saxon, the language of the *Heliand*, the fragments of a metrical version of Genesis (eighth century A.D.).

Leaving out the other minor dialects of Western Germanic, we shall now briefly discuss the main body of Western Germanic dialects—the dialects comprehended by the term Old High German,—by far the most important common characteristic of which is the so-called second Germanic sound-shift. Even the first Germanic sound-shift (see below) was not a single event occurring at a single point of time. The second Germanic sound-shift was even more of a pro-

† It should be noted that Anglo-Saxon (Ags) means Old English, i.e. the Germanic languages of England up to 1100 A.D.

tracted process comprehending a series of individual linguistic events scattered over a long period and a wide area, so that it not only marks off High German from Low German, but also supplies criteria for linguistic grouping within High German.

The first event of this linguistic process took place about 600 A.D.: through it Germanic surd occlusives *after vowel* became hard spirants ($p > ff$; $k > ch$, hh , h ; t became z pronounced not as a fricative as in Mod. German, but as the hard spirant ss). Thus O.H.G. *trëffan*: O. Sax. *drëpan*; O.H.G. *gi-skaffan*: Goth. *skapans*: O. Sax. *gi-skapan*; O.H.G. *uuahhën*: Goth. *wakan*; O.H.G. *rëhhan*: Goth. *wrikan*; O.H.G. *ëzzan*: Goth. *itan*. These hard spirants are very probably nothing but assimilated fricatives: thus $p > pf > ff$, $k > kch > ch$ and $t > ts > ss$ (z). Neither the first primitive Germanic sound-shift, nor the second High German one, did affect the combinations *sp*, *sk*, *st*, *ht*, *ft*. The second sound-shift moreover left untouched the combination *tr*; cf. O.H.G. *triuua*: Goth. *triggwa*, O.H.G. *trëtan*: Goth. *trudan*. The shift of *t* to *z* took place practically all over the Old High German region; cf. O.H.G. *zëhan*: Goth. *taihun*, O.H.G. *ziohan*: Goth. *tiuhan*, O.H.G. *hërza*: Goth. *hairtô*. Yet this shift of *t* to *z* was eluded by Middle Frankish; thus M. Fr. *tuschen*=Mod. Germ. *zwischen*.—The shift of *p* to *pf* (usually written *ph* in O.H.G.) took place in a more restricted area; thus O.H.G. *phlëgan*: Ags. *plezan*, O.H.G. *scephan*: O. Sax. *sceppean* (Goth. *skapjan*). Also after liquids, primitive Germanic *p* at first changed to the corresponding fricative (*pf*) and then became a simple spirant; thus O.H.G. *hëlphan* (M.H.G. *hëlffen*): Goth. *hilpan*, O.H.G. *uuërphan* (M.H.G. *wërffen*): Goth. *wairpan*.—The sound which the primitive Germanic *k* developed into as the result of this second shift cannot be established with absolute certainty, for the transmitted written forms are all ambiguous and misleading. For the oldest period however this much can be said that the result of the shift of *k* was not the *ch* of mod. German, for it is expressed by *hh* (in final simply *h*). Later however this *hh* was replaced by *ch*.

Primitive Germanic spirants too, both surd and sonant, were affected by this second shift, though not in the same way as the occlusives. Prim. Germ. *f* was retained as a voiceless spirant in upper Germany and large parts of middle Germany. In lower Germany and the Rhine-region on the other hand it became voiced after sonants and thus coincided with the sound expressed in the literary language by *b*. The voiceless *f*=prim. Germ. *f* was at first distinguished from the later *f* < *p*: the latter was originally always geminated and was pronounced with greater intensity even when the gemination was simplified. It cannot be proved that there was any other difference between these two sounds expressed by *f*, though it is often held that the older *f* was always dento-labial as at present, whereas the later one at least for some time was a bilabial sound.

The intensity of the later spirant sometimes used to be expressed by double-writing (*ff*), and the mildness of the earlier one by the optional use of *v*. But the older *f* is never expressed by *v* in the combination *ft*.—Primitive Germ. *h* with its two values *h* and *χ* has not been affected by the second sound-shift. The original sound *χ*, so far as it was preserved, coincided with the spirant originated from *k*, and was originally expressed by *hh* between vowels and by *h* in final position and in the combinations *ht* and *hs*. Primitive Germanic *þ* however was lost. At first it was softened into *ð*, which then further changed into *d*. This new *d* coincided with the Western Germanic *d* so far as the latter was not shifted to *t*.

It is difficult to describe in a few words how the primitive Germanic voiced spirants were affected by the second shift. The primitive Germanic voiced spirants have to some extent become occlusives in all the Germanic dialects, namely after nasal, in gemination, and in initial position. Only initial *z* remained a spirant in Ags. and O. Sax. The dental voiced spirant too became occlusive everywhere. On the other hand, the shift of the labial and velar-palatal sonant spirants after vowel, *l* and *r* to the corresponding occlusives is a characteristic of High German alone. The voiced spirants thus reduced to soft occlusives, along with the original pure soft occlusives, then further changed to surd occlusives in large parts of the High German area.—But it is unnecessary for our present purpose to go further into the details of High German dialectology. We are now sufficiently equipped to reconstruct primitive Germanic forms on the basis of the cognate Indo-European languages on the one hand and the historical German dialects on the other.

By far the most important fact of primitive Germanic phonology is Grimm's Law of first Germanic sound-shift* by which the occlusives derived from the primitive Indo-European were vitally affected. Like the second sound-shift the first too was to all appearance a tardy process extending over a pretty long time, but it was already over at the beginning of the Christian era—as also the action of Verner's Law—as the Graeco-Roman loan-words in Germanic clearly prove. The two Scythian loan-words in Germanic, Goth. *paida* : Scyth. *baîtē* and Ags. *hanep* : Scyth. *kánnabis*, suggest moreover that the eastern and western Germans were still living together at the time of contact with the north-Iranian invaders; but the borrowing of these two words must have taken place before the first Germanic sound-shift which has left its unmistakable mark on them.

The process of Germanic consonant-mutation should have begun with the

* The law of second Germanic sound-shift affecting only the High German group of Western Germanic dialects, which has been already described above, was also discovered by Grimm. Usually the two laws are simply called Grimm's first Law and second Law respectively.

shift of I.-E. aspirated sonants to the corresponding soft spirants (*gh bh dh > g ǵ ǵ*), for the aspirated sonants were the least stable of the Indo-European sounds. These soft spirants however mostly appear as the corresponding occlusives in the historical dialects. Thus Goth. *guma* "man" < I.-E. *ǵhāmen- (connected with Skt. *kṣmā*); Goth. *agis* "fear" < I.-E. *aǵhes- (cf. Gr. *dkhos*); O.N. *miðr* < *miðjaz=I.-E. *medh₂os (Skt. *mādhya*); O.N. *mǵðr* < *meðu=I.-E. *medhu (Gr. *mēthu*, Skt. *mādhu*); O.H.G. *nēbal* < I.-E. *nebholā (cf. Skt. *nābhas*, Gr. *nephēlē*, Lat. *nebula*); Goth. *bairan* (Skt. *bhar-*, Gr. *phērō*); Ags. *beofaþ*=Skt. *bībheti*.—Indo-European aspirated tenues (as also the pure tenues) were shifted to voiceless spirants. Thus O.H.G. *feim* : Skt. *phena*; O.H.G. *riha* : Skt. *rēkha*; O.H.G. *huof* "hoof": Skt. *śaphā*; Goth. *hwāþō* : Skt. *kvath-*; Goth. *wiþōn* : Skt. *vyath-*.

Indo-European *k t p* were shifted to *χ þ f* (the sound *χ* is expressed in writing by *h*) in primitive Germanic. Thus Goth. *hairn* : Lat. *cornu* (Skt. *śṛṅga*); Goth. *hairtō* : Lat. *cord-* (Skt. *hṛd-*); Ags. *þynne* : Lat. *tenūis* (Skt. *tanū*); Goth. *þreis* : Skt. *trāyah*; Goth. *fōtus* : Skt. *pad-*; Goth. *faihu* : Skt. *pāśu*.—In the same way, Indo-European *g d b* were shifted to *k t p*. Thus Goth. *qinō* : Skt. *gnā*; Goth. *akrs* : Gr. *agrós* (Skt. *ājra*); Goth. *kniu* : Gr. *gónu* (Skt. *jānu*); Goth. *sitan* : Lat. *sedere* (Skt. *sad-*); Ags. *swēte* : Gr. *hēdús* (Skt. *svādú*). As the sound *b* was of rare occurrence in the original Indo-European, it is not surprising that we have very few examples with which to prove the shift of I.-E. *b* to *p* in primitive Germanic; yet see Goth. *þaurp* : Lat. *tribus*. The first assumption regarding a Germanic form pointing to an I.-E. *b* is however that it is a loan-word. Thus, many of the numerous words in mod. German beginning with *pf* (e.g. *Pfeffer*, *Pfahl*, *Pferd*), which would normally point to an I.-E. *b* (*b > p > pf*), are loan-words from Latin (e.g. *piper*, *palus*, *paraveredus*); but in many cases it is no longer possible to point out the source from which the Germans had borrowed, e.g. *Pfennig*, *Pflicht*, *Pflug*.

Grimm's first law of primitive Germanic sound-shift as stated above of course does not work so smoothly as the given examples would imply. In fact it has to be supplemented on the one hand by Grassmann's Law of the dissimilation of aspirates (LIS., p. 10) affecting all the Indo-European languages, and on the other by Verner's Law affecting specifically the Germanic dialects. Moreover, certain combinations (e.g. *kt*, *pt*, *tt* and *sk*, *st*, *sp*) defied Grimm's Law even without any instigation from Grassmann or Verner. The second element in *kt* and *pt* was not shifted at all; thus Goth. *ahtau* : Skt. *aṣṭáu*, Goth. *nahts* : Skt. *nakṭ-*, O.H.G. *nift(ila)* : Skt. *napitṭ*. I.-E. *tt* through *þt* became *ss* in the early Germanic dialects; thus Goth. *ga-wiss* < **ga-wit-tos*. The combinations *sp*, *st* and *sk* remained quite unchanged in Germanic. Thus O.H.G. *spēhōn* : Lat. *con-spicio* (Skt. *spāś-*), O.H.G. *wuosti* : Lat. *vastus* "waste", Goth.

fisks : Lat. *piscis* "fish". I.-E. *skh sth sph* concided with I.-E. *sk st sp* in Germanic. Thus Goth. *skaidan* : Skt. *chid-* (* *sk̐hid-*), O.H.G. *stān* : Skt. *sthā-*, O.H.G. *spurnan* : Skt. *sphur-*.

These exceptions to the law of primitive Germanic sound-shift were noticed and explained by Grimm himself. But a large number of *apparent* exceptions to Grimm's Law were explained by Grassmann. Examples like Goth. *biudan* : Skt. *budh-*, Goth. *deigan* : Skt. *dih-* were clearly against Grimm's Law which would require the two Gothic forms to begin with *p* and *t* respectively. But from Grassmann's Law it followed as a necessary corollary that these seemingly irreconcilable examples are altogether irrelevant to the point in issue, for the original Indo-European forms of these roots were **bhendh-* and **dheiǵh-*. Thus it was proved that Goth. *biudan* was derived from **bheudh-* as Goth. *deigan* from **dheiǵh-*, and that everything was in order (see LIS., p. 10).

Verner's Law may be formulated as follows: The four surd spirants (*h* *þ* *f* *s*) existing in primitive Germanic after the primitive Germanic sound-shift were softened wherever the seat of the Indo-European accent was not on the immediately preceding syllable, the combinations *ht hs ft fs sk st* and *sp* however remaining quite unaffected. The significance of this law is quite obvious. On the one hand it affords a means to reconstruct Indo-European accent on the basis of Germanic alone, and on the other it explains the so-called *grammatical alternance* (grammatischer Wechsel) observed within congenèric Germanic forms. But most important of all, it explains almost all the exceptions to Grimm's Law. It is worth remembering in this connection that the battle-cry of "infallibility of phonetic laws" was raised only after Verner's brilliant discovery.

To illustrate Verner's Law, let us first consider some examples in which the primitive Germanic surd spirants have been retained after immediately preceding I.-E. accent. Cf. Goth. *faihu* : Skt. *pásu* (I.-E. **pék̑u*); Goth. *taihun* : Skt. *dása* (Gr. *déka*); Goth. *brōþar* : Skt. *bhrātar*; Goth. *fiṃf* : Skt. *pāñca* (I.-E. **pén̑k̑w-*); Goth. *wulfs* : Skt. *vṛka* (I.-E. *uṛk̑w-*). It will be clear from these and similar examples that every syllable ending with a surd spirant in a Germanic form corresponds to the stressed syllable of the corresponding Indo-European form. Thus the first syllable *hals-* of the Gothic form *halsa* ends with the surd spirant *s*; hence it can be safely assumed that in the corresponding Indo-European form **k̑wólso-* the first syllable was accented. And it also follows from Verner's Law that every syllable ending with a sonant spirant in a Germanic form must have been accentless in the corresponding form of the original Indo-European. Thus I.-E. **patér* became **faþér* in primitive Germanic, but through Verner's Law this **faþér* further changed into **fader* (from which is directly derived Goth. *fadar* etc.). The sonant spirants thus secondarily origi-

nated often however changed further into sonant occlusives (under circumstances to be discussed below), to the result that through Verner's Law simply a Germanic sonant occlusive may correspond to an Indo-European surd occlusive. Thus Goth. *hund* < **hundō* < **hunþō* : I.-E. **k̑mtó* > Skt. *śatá* ; Goth. *hardus* < **harþú* : Gr. *kratús* ; Goth. *þridja* : Skt. *tr̥t̥t̥ya* ; O. Norse *ylgr* : Skt. *vṛkt̥* ; O.H.G. *swigar* : Skt. *śvaśr̥ā* (< I.-E. **suek̑*-); Ags. *snoru* < **snozu* : Skt. *śnuṣṭā*.—Indo-European voiceless aspirated occlusives too can in the same way appear as pure sonants in Germanic : I.-E. *th ph kh* > *þ f x* (Grimm's Law) > *d b g* (Verner's Law). Thus Old Norse *fold* : Skt. *pṛthvī* ; O.H.G. *nagal* : Skt. *nakhā* ; M.H.G. *hübel* : Avest. *kaofa* "hill."

So far we have studied Verner's Law only as it modifies Germanic sounds *vis à vis* the Indo-European sound-system. But Verner's Law is responsible also for the *grammatical alternance*—a sort of consonantal ablaut—observed within congeneric Germanic forms. But it should be noted that this grammatical alternance has been largely obliterated through analogy in Gothic. It is, however, a prominent feature of the other Old Germanic dialects. Thus O.H.G. *ziohan* : *gi-zogan*, *dihan* : *gi-digan*, Ags. *sēoþan* : *sudon*, *cēosan* : *curon* etc. This alternance between *h* and *g*, *þ* and *d*, *s* and *r* (< *z*) in congeneric Germanic forms can be fully explained in terms of Verner's Law as the result of Indo-European accent-shift revealed by analogous forms in Sanskrit. Thus the 3. pers. sing. of perfect from *vṛt-* is *va-vṛt-a* in Sanskrit, and the corresponding form of 1. pers. pl. is *va-vṛt-mā* : it is due to this shift of accent that the *s* in Ags. *cēas* (3. pers. sing. perf.) changes (through *z*) to *r* in *curon* (1. pers. pl. perf.). But Anglo-Saxon is not alone among Germanic dialects in showing this consonantal alternance due to accent-shift in the original Indo-European. The corresponding forms of this verb in the other dialects are as follows :—O. Icelandic *kaus* : *kþrom*, O. Friesian *kas* : *keron*, O. Saxon *kōs* : *kurun*, O.H.G. *kōs* : *kurum*. Though not in verbal conjugation (excepting a few unconvincing cases), this alternance may be observed also in Gothic ; cf. *fraþi* "understanding" : *frōdei* "intelligence," *taihun* "ten" : *tigjus* "decades", *ga-filh* "burial" : *fulgins* "concealed" etc.—In the original Indo-European, words sometimes changed their accent when in compound ; thus in Skt., simplex *catūr* but compound *cātuṣ-pad*. This accent-shift too can be traced in Germanic in the light of Verner's Law ; cf. Goth. *fidwōr* "four" but Ags. *fyþer-fēte* "four-footed."

Primitive Germanic voiced spirants, originated either through Verner's Law from primitive Germanic voiceless spirants or directly derived from Indo-European sonant aspirates, changed to a large extent into pure sonants *already in primitive Germanic*. Initially and after homorganic nasals *þ* and *d* are attested only as occlusives. Thus prim. Germ. **þendan* (< I.-E. **bhendh-* : Skt. *bandh-*) is purely a postulate of the theory of Germanic sound-shift without

any factual basis in the Germanic languages. For the same reason prim. Germ. **đumþaz* (> Goth. *dumbs*) is merely a grammatical construction. The sound *đ* seems to have become an occlusive already in primitive Germanic also after *l* and *z*, for nowhere do we find any sure trace of *lđ zđ*; only of *ld zd*. Thus Goth. *kalds*: O. Norse. *kaldr*: Ags. *ceald*; Goth. *huzd*: O. Norse. *hoddr*: Ags. *hord*. Primitive Germanic *rđ* however is retained in Nordic (cf. *gard bord*) though not in eastern (cf. Goth. *gards baird*) or western (cf. Ags. *geard bord*) Germanic.

In connection with Grimm's and Verner's Laws we have already discussed the essential features of the history of Indo-European occlusives in Germanic. But the three series of Indo-European gutturals require special consideration, for their development within Germanic is extremely complicated on account of the various sound-shifts discussed above.

I.-E. *ǵ* became *χ* in initial position in primitive Germanic; in medial and final position too it became *χ* if the I.-E. accent immediately preceded it; it became *g* in medial and final position if the I.-E. accent was not on the immediately preceding syllable; after *s* it everywhere became *k*. Moreover we have to remember that the sound *χ* is usually indicated by the sign *h*. Thus I.-E. **ǵm̥tō*-m: prim. Germ. **χunda*-n: Goth. *hunda*; I.-E. **ǵēku* (Skt. *pásu*): prim. Germ. **feχu*: Goth. *faihu*; from I.-E. **iǵ-* (cf. Skt. *īse*) is derived Goth. *aigun*, in 3. pers. plur. The basic form here should have been **iǵ.ŋ* (with accent on *ŋ*). Goth. *skeinan* "to shine" seems to be derived from I.-E. **sǵi-*.—There is no sure trace of I.-E. *ǵh* in Germanic.—I.-E. *ǵ* became *k* in prim. Germ. and remained so in Goth. Thus I.-E. **ǵeus*: Skt. *jósati*: Goth. *kiusan*; I.-E. **aǵró*-s: Skt. *ábrah*, prim. Germ. **akraz*, Goth. *akrs*.—I.-E. *ǵh* became *g* in prim. Germanic (*g* after *n*) and *g* in Gothic; thus I.-E. **ǵh̥mon*:- prim. Germ. **guman*:- Goth. *guma*.

Indo-European pure velars have coincided with the palatals in Germanic. The labio-velars however can be distinguished by the element *w* in their Germanic descendants, but this element too is often wanting, specially before *u* and *o*. Primitive Germanic representative of I.-E. *k^w* should have been *χw* which however might change into *gw* according to Verner's Law. Thus I.-E. **lelk^we-ti* (Gr. *leipō*, Skt. *rinākti*) > prim. Germ. **liχwid*[i] > Goth. *leihtiþ*; I.-E. **régwes-* (Skt. *rájas*) > prim. Germ. **rekwez-* > Goth. *riqis*; I.-E. **sok^w-lós* (from **sek^w*: Skt. *sac-*) > prim. Germ. **sagwłaz* > O. Icel. *seggr* "socius." Through the influence of a preceding labial consonant, *k^w*, through *χw*, in some cases became *f* already in primitive Germanic; according to Verner's Law, this *f* might also appear as *þ*. Thus I.-E. **ulko-s* > prim. Germ. **ulfa-z* > Goth. *wulfs*; I.-E. **pénk^we* > prim. Germ. **fimf* (the same form in Goth. and O.H.G.); I.-E. **ul̥* > prim. Germ. **ulgwł* > **ulþi*;

O.H.G. *wulpa* (with a different suffix). As for I.-E. g^w , which became *kw* in primitive Germanic (simply *k* before *u* and *o*), let us consider I.-E. $*g^w i u o s >$ prim. Germ. $*k u i u a - z >$ Goth. *qius* : Skt. *jivāḥ*. I.-E. $*g^w h$ should have become *gw* in primitive Germanic. We do find traces of this *gw*, but usually either as *g* or *w* (not both). Before guttural vowels (even of secondary origin) the element *w* is invariably lost. Thus from I.-E. $*g^w h_1 n_2 -$ we have O. Icel. *gunnr* (*un* $< n_2$); but I.-E. $*g^w h o r m o s$ (Skt. *gharmāḥ*) $>$ prim. Germ. $*u a r m a z >$ O.H.G. *warm* (Goth. *warmjan*).—It will be clear from this that it is never easy and often impossible to identify a Germanic guttural from the stand-point of Indo-European sound-system. But it is necessary to remember that Goth. *q*, the origin of which has not yet been fully explained, as a rule points to Indo-European sonant labio-velar (see Braune, *Gotische Grammatik*, 10th ed., § 59).

Of Indo-European consonants only the nasals, liquids and the semivowels had on the whole a peaceful existence in Germanic. Yet final *m* changed into *n*, cf. Goth. *fan-a* : Skt. *tām*; and *n* disappeared in primitive Germanic before $\chi (=h)$, (extending the preceding vowel in compensation), as may be observed also in mod. German *bringen* : *brachte*. The semivowels too were on the whole retained unchanged in primitive Germanic; cf. Goth. *juk* : Skt. *yug-ām*, Goth. *frija-* : Skt. *priyā*, Goth. *widuwō* : Skt. *vidhāvā*, O. Norse *tívar* : Skt. *devāḥ* etc. The liquids *r* and *l* were not changed at all; cf. Lat. *cornu* : Goth. *haurrn*, Lat. *granum* : Goth. *kaurn*, Gr. *polú* : Goth. *filu*, Lat. *alius*, Goth. *aljis*.

We shall now briefly review the history of Indo-European vowels—mainly of stressed Germanic syllables—in primitive Germanic. I.-E. $i =$ prim. Germ. $i =$ Goth. *i*; thus Goth. *witum* : Skt. *vidmā*. Before *h*, *h*₂ and *r* however this *i* is “broken” into *e* (written *ai* according to the modern transcription of Gothic); thus I.-E. $*u i r o s$ (Skt. *vīrāḥ*) : prim. Germ. $*u i r a z$: Goth. *wair*; I.-E. $*d i k̃$ (Skt. *dis̥d̥ti*) : prim. Germ. $*t i h$: Goth. *ga-taihun* “they proclaimed.” This “breaking” does not affect vowels of unstressed syllables as was already mentioned above.—I.-E. $i =$ prim. Germ. $i =$ Goth. *ī* (written *ei*); thus Goth. *deisei* (in *filu-deisei*) : Skt. *dhītīḥ*. I.-E. $u =$ prim. Germ. $u =$ Goth. *u* (broken into *au*, i.e. open *o*, before *h*, *h*₂, *r*). Thus I.-E. $*u g o m$ (Skt. *yugām*) : prim. Germ. $*u k a n$: Goth. *juk*; I.-E. $*d h u g^w h a t̃ e r$ (Skt. *duhitā*) : prim. Germ. $*d u h t e r$: Goth. *dauhtar*. The *u* remains unbroken not only before unstressed *h* (as in the enclitic particle *-uh*) but also before *r* $< z < s$; hence Goth. *ur*.—I.-E. $ū =$ prim. Germ. $ū =$ Goth. *ū*; cf. Goth. *jūs* “you” : Skt. *yūyām* (instead of $*yūram < *yūzam$; LIS., p. 138).

I.-E. *e* (=Goth. *i*) normally remained unchanged in prim. Germanic (this secondary *i* too is broken into *ai* in Gothic before *h*, *h*₂, *r*). Cf. I.-E. $*g^w e n ā$ (Skt. *gnā*) : prim. Germ. $*k u n ō n$: Goth. *qinō* : O.H.G. *quena* etc.; I.-E. $*p e k̃ u$ (Skt. *pásu*) : prim. Germ. $*f i h u$, Goth. *faihu*; I.-E. $*m e d h i o s$: prim. Germ.

**midīaz*: Goth. *midjis*, O.H.G. *mitti*, Ags. *midd* etc. Already in primitive Germanic *e* changed into *i* before a covered nasal or through the attraction of an *i* in the following syllable: thus I.-E. **bhendh-* (Skt. *bandh-*): Goth. *bīndan* etc.; I.-E. **senti* (enclitic verb-form of the principal clause): prim. Germ. **sindi*: Goth. *sind*; I.-E. **ésti* (Skt. *ásti*): prim. Germ. **isti*: Goth. *ist*.—The history of I.-E. *ē* in Germanic is very peculiar. In primitive Germanic it became a very open sound (\bar{e}), but in Gothic it became very closed (\bar{e}) through a process of retrogression; in Western and Northern Germanic however \bar{e} through a reverse process became \bar{a} ; in Anglo-Friesian this \bar{a} was again narrowed into $\bar{æ}$. Thus from I.-E. **sē-* “to sow” we have Goth. *mana-sēþs* “mankind”, O. Icel. *sāþ*, Ags. *sæd*, O. Fr. *sēd*, O.H.G. *sāt*; I.-E. **dhē-*: prim. Germ. **dēdiz* “deed”: Goth. *ga-dēds*, Ags. *dæd*, O. Fr. *dēd*, O. Sax. *dād*, O.H.G. *tāt*. But beside this open \bar{e} (< I.-E. *ē*) there was in primitive Germanic a closed \bar{e} derived from I.-E. *ēi* (the long diphthong). Usually the Germ. \bar{e} < I.-E. *ē* is called \bar{e}^1 , and the Germ. \bar{e} < I.-E. *ēi* is called \bar{e}^2 . This \bar{e}^2 was preserved as \bar{e} not only in Gothic but also in O. Icelandic, Ags., O. Sax., as well as in O.H.G. of the oldest period. Later however \bar{e}^2 in O.H.G. became *ea* > *ia* > *ie* which was a diphthong still in M.H.G., but in modern German it has become a long monophthong. Thus from an I.-E. demonstrative stem **h₂ez-* we have *hēr* in Goth., O. Sax., O. Icel. and Ags., but in O.H.G. *hēr*, *hear*, *hiar*, *hier* “here”. This \bar{e}^2 is in evidence also in Goth. *fēra* “side”: O.H.G. *fēra*, *feara*, *fiara*, and in loan-words such as Goth. *mēs* (from vulg. Lat. *mēsa* < *mēnsa*), O.H.G. *meas*, *mias* “table.”

I.-E. \bar{o} > prim. Germ. *a* = Goth. *a*, but usually $\bar{æ}$ in Ags. Thus I.-E. **k^wod-*: Goth. *hwa*, O. Icel. *huat*, Ags. *hwæt*, O. Sax. *hwat*, O.H.G. *hwaz*; I.-E. **bh₂eronti* (Skt. *bhāranti*): prim. Germ. **berand(i)*: Goth. *bairand*: O.H.G. *berant*.—I.-E. \bar{o} remained practically unchanged in Germanic excepting in O.H.G. where it became *oa*, *ua*, *uo*. Thus I.-E. **dhōmos* (Skt. *dhāman*): prim. Germ. **dōmaz*, Goth. *dōms*, O. Icel. *dōmr*, Ags. *dōm*, O.H.G. *tuom* etc.—I.-E. *a* remained unchanged in primitive Germanic. Thus I.-E. **āgros* (Skt. *ajrah*): prim. Germ. **akraz*: Goth. *akrs*, O.H.G. *acchar* etc.—I.-E. \bar{a} however became \bar{o} in prim. Germanic, which later changed into *oa* *ua* *uo* in O.H.G.; thus I.-E. **bhrātēr*: prim. Germ. **brōþēr*, Goth. *brōþar*, O.H.G. *bruoder*.—I.-E. \bar{e} coincided with I.-E. *a* in all the I.-E. dialects excepting Indo-Iranian. Hence I.-E. **p₂etēr* (Skt. *pitā*): prim. Germ. **fadēr*, Goth. *fadar*, O. Sax. *fader*, O.H.G. *fater* etc.

Of Indo-European short diphthongs, *ei* became \bar{i} in primitive Germanic. Thus I.-E. **steighō* (Skt. *stighnoti*): prim. Germ. **stigō*: Goth. *steiga*; I.-E. **bheid-* (Skt. *bhid-*): prim. Germ. **bīt-*: Goth. *beitan*, O.H.G. *bīzan* “to bite.”—I.-E. *oi* became *ai* in prim. Germ. (but \bar{a} in Ags. and *ei* in O.H.G.). Thus I.-E. **oinos* “one”: prim. Germ. **ainaz*, Goth. *ains*, Ags. *ān*, O.H.G. *ein*; I.-E. **uoidā* (Skt. *véda*): prim. Germ. **uait(a)*: Goth. *wait*, Ags. *wāt*, O.H.G. *weiz*.—

I.-E. *eu* remained unchanged in prim. Germanic, but became *iu* in Goth., *eo* in Ags., *eo iu* etc. in O.H.G. Thus from I.-E. **leuk^w*. (Skt. *ruc-*) we have prim. Germ. **leuχ-*: Goth. *liuha*, Ags. *lēoht*, O.H.G. *leoht* "light".—I.-E. *au* and *ou* coincided in *au* in prim. Germanic and remained so in Goth. but changed to *ēa* in Ags. and *ō*, *ou* in O.H.G. Thus I.-E. **roudhos* (Skt. *rudh-i-rá*): prim. Germ. **raudaz*, Goth. *rauþs*, Ags. *rēad*, O.H.G. *rōt*; I.-E. **aug^w*- (Skt. *ójah*): Goth. *aukan*, Ags. *ēacian*, O.H.G. *ouhhōn*.

Of I.-E. long diphthongs the most important thing to remember is that I.-E. *ēi* has become *ē²* in Germanic. In other cases the long diphthongs cannot well be separated from the corresponding short ones in Germanic.

But Germanic vocalism cannot be understood without an idea of the effects of the initial expiratory accent of primitive Germanic which entailed the contraction of middle syllables and the loss of final ones. To pursue these phenomena specifically in the individual dialects will however take us too far. Our chief concern here is to try to ascertain how Indo-European forms were affected by Germanic accent.

That in primitive Germanic the Indo-European forms still retained their full endings is proved most clearly by the early Germanic loan-words in Finnish—such as *kuningas* "king," *rengas* "ring," *tiuris* "dear" etc. But the evidence of the Germanic languages themselves is hardly less conclusive in this respect. The oldest runic inscriptions too show Germanic forms with equally full endings; cf. *dagaR*, *holtingaR* etc. The endings have been syn-copated in historical Germanic forms of two or more syllables; but in monosyllabic words the endings have been largely retained. Thus in monosyllabic Gothic pronominal forms such as *sō* *þō* we have the Indo-European feminine ending *-ā* preserved in a Germanic garb. But polysyllabic words tell a different story; thus Goth. *gibā* from prim. Germ. **gibō*, Goth. *waúrdā* from prim. Germ. **wordō*. Yet the length of the final syllables also of polysyllabic words is retained in Gothic before enclitic particles; cf. *heilā* but *heilō-hun*, *hammā* but *hammē-h*.—Germanic proper names recorded by Roman authors clearly show that the contraction of final syllables in polysyllabic Germanic forms should have begun not before the third century A.D.; cf. *Nerthus*, *Albis*, *Segimundus* etc. But the process must have been over by the middle of the fourth Century, for in Gothic there is no trace of these final syllables.

Chronologically the earliest change affecting final syllables is the change of final *m* to *n*—which has been mentioned above. But every final *n*—including *n* < *m*—then disappeared after nasalising the preceding vowel; thus prim. Germ. **hornan* > **hornā*, prim. Germ. **gebōn*, > **gebō* etc. That at the earliest stage these final vowels had actually a nasal timbre can be inferred

from the fact that in the runic inscriptions the final vowels which were never followed by a nasal are lost, though the vowels which were originally followed by a nasal are retained. But the nasal timbre of these final vowels was already lost at the time of earliest Finnish borrowings from Germanic, for neuter nouns which originally had a nasal ending show no trace of the nasal in the Finnish forms. Thus Finn. *gulta* "gold," *viina* "wine" (Goth. *gulþ*, *wein*).—Final dentals too must have been dropped very early in this process, for the long vowels preceding the dropped dental are shortened in the same way as final long vowels. Thus Goth. *wili* < **welīt* : Lat. *velīt*; Goth. *bairun* < I.-E. **bherunt*; Goth. *iddja* < prim. Germ. **iŋēd* : Skt. *āyāt*; O.H.G. *nēvo* : Skt. *nāpāt*. Non-nasal final *ā ē ō* disappeared altogether: thus Goth. *wāt* < I.-E. **uōida* (Skt. *vēda*); Goth. *fimf* < I.-E. **pe.nkʷe* (Skt. *pāñca*); Goth. *þis* < prim. Germ. **þeso* < I.-E. **te-so* "his."—Germanic morphology has been profoundly influenced by another law about the shortening of final syllables: already in pre-runic period the final *i* of trisyllabic words was dropped. Cf. Goth. *bairand* : Skt. *bhāraṇti*, run. *ubar* : Skt. *upāri*. On account of this law, the primitive Germanic forms corresponding to Skt. *bibhemi bibheṣi bibheti* must have been **biḥbaim* **biḥbaiz* **biḥbaid*.—The closed long vowels *ī ū ō*, whether covered or not, were shortened in final syllables. Gothic feminine forms like *mawi* *fīwi* prove the case for *-ī*, as also Goth. *wili* : Lat. *velīt*. Shortening of final *-ū* in primitive Germanic has to be assumed in order to reconcile O.H.G. *swigar* (< **swigrū*) with Skt. *śvaśrū*. And only by assuming a similar shortening of *-ō* of final syllable in prim. Germanic can we reconcile Goth *baira* with Western Germ. *beru* (both from **berō* < **bherō* < **bherō*).

We shall now mention just a few primary and secondary suffixes proving the I.-E. origin and also the specific Germanic character of the languages concerned. Of the participial suffixes, *-uos* of active perfect (see LIS., p. 99) has been practically given up in Germanic, but cf. Goth. *weit-wōd-* (:Skt. *vid-vās*) and *bērusjōs* "those who have borne, parents" from **bher-*. The corresponding present suffix *-nt* appears in the expected form *-nd* in Germanic, cf. Goth. *frijōnds* (participle of the denominative from I.-E. **prigo* : Skt. *prijḍ*), *fjands* "foe" (from I.-E. **pēi-*); its feminine form (I.-E. *-ntī*) too is clearly perceptible in Goth. *gibandei* etc.—Both the I.-E. suffixes *-to* and *-no* of perfect participle (see LIS., pp. 100-101) are fully in evidence in Germanic. As in all other I.-E. dialects, so in Germanic too, secondarily derived verbs can take only *-to* and never *-no*. Specifically for Germanic, however, should be noted that the weak verbs which in preterite have the dental suffix *-ta* instead of *-da* (see below), form also their past participles with *-t-*; thus Goth. *bugjan* "to buy": pret. *baūhta* : past part. *baūhts*; Goth. *waūrkan* "to work": pret. *waūrhta* : past part. *waūrhts* (Streitberg, § 228). The same striking agreement between the parti-

ciple and the preterite may be observed also in the case of preterital presents; thus Goth. *kunnan* "to know": pret. *kunþa*: past part. *kunþs*; Goth. *þaurban* "to need": pret. *þaurfta*: past part. *þaurfts*. In most cases however Germanic participles with this dental suffix are nominal in meaning as frequently also in Skt. (LIS., p. 101); thus O.H.G. *lūt*: Skt. *śrutá*, Goth. *raihts*: Lat. *rectus* etc. In spite of this multifarious activity the suffix *-to* in Germanic has lost much ground to its great rival *-no*. The chief class of strong verbs knows nothing of *to*-participles. The participial suffix *-no* in fact dominates the strong conjugation in Germanic as *-to* the weak. The suffix *-en* in mod. Germ. *ge-sehen*, *ge-kommen* etc. is in the last analysis nothing but the suffix *-na* in Skt. *pūrṇá* etc., initially re-inforced by an *a-* (*-ana*); English *bitten* is thus nothing but our Skt. *bhinnd*. It may be mentioned in passing that the unstressed *ga-* (mod. Germ. *ge-*) prefixed to passive participles of simple verbs was a feature of Western Germanic only, but in no dialect was it considered absolutely necessary. The infinitive suffix *-en* (Goth. *-an*) of mod. German is considered to be derived from pre-Germanic *-onom* (> prim. Germ. *-anan*), the accusative form of the Indo-European suffix *-ono*=Skt. *-ana* in *ádana*, *bándhana* (Goth. *itan*, *bindan*). This explanation of the Germanic infinitive was favoured by Kluge (Urgermanisch, 3rd ed., § 188).

As for purely nominal suffixes it has to be noted first of all that they are mostly specifically Germanic, of hardly any significance for Sanskrit or the original Indo-European. This is because the suffixal parts were mostly lost in Germanic on account of its initial stress-accent, so that the Germans had to improvise new suffixes wherever necessary. Monosyllabic suffixes are as a rule less productive than the polysyllabic ones in Germanic. Thus the suffix *-nī* (in Skt. *pátnī*, *rājñī*) is less productive in Germanic than its side-form *-enī* (cf. Goth. *Saurini* etc.). Of Indo-European dental suffixes, *-ti* is well represented in Germanic (cf. the Gothic verbal abstracta *ga-baurþs*, *ga-qumþs* etc.); but much more productive is Germ. *-iþa* < I.-E. *-etā*, the suffix of adjective abstracta corresponding to Skt. *-tā* (or *-atā* when the stem is thematic); cf. Goth. *hauhiþa*, *hlūtriþa* etc.—Of comparative suffixes (see LIS., pp. 103–106), *-ro* is clearly in evidence in Goth. *anþar* (Skt. *ántara*), and its superlative counterpart *-mo* in Goth. *fruma* (indirectly connected with Lat. *primus* **prismos*). The suffixes *-tero* and *-təmo* have left but faint traces in Germanic, but cf. Ags. *furdur* and *furdum*. The intensive suffix *-ison* (LIS., p. 105) is clearly in evidence in Germanic; cf. Goth. *miniza* from prim. Germ. **mi-nw-ison-*, Goth. *sutizins* < **swadison-*. Similarly *-isto*; cf. Goth. *hardus* *hardiza* *hardista*, O.H.G. *jung* *jungiro* *jungisto* (corresponding to Skt. *yúvan*, *yáviyas* *yáviṣṭha*).

Indo-European case-system has been very much simplified in Germanic. In substantive-declension the first thing to note is the disappearance of the

dual number, which however continued for sometime longer to be a living factor with pronouns and verbs. Traces of dual number in substantive-declension is to be found in forms like Ags. *nosu*, *duru* etc.

The Indo-European ending *-s* in nom. sg. is clearly in evidence in the early Germanic loan-words in Finnish such as *kuningas*, *rengas* etc. Cf. also Goth. *dags gasts sunus* = O. Norse *dagr gestr sunr*. In Western Germanic however this ending was lost phonologically; hence O.H.G. *tag gast sunu*. But in monosyllabic pronominal forms the ending *-s* (> *-r*) is retained also in Old High German, cf. *wër* etc. The Indo-European nominative ending *-(o)m* of neuter *o*-stems has disappeared in Germanic, but not without leaving a trace behind as explained above; thus run. *horna*: early Germ. *horn* (Skt. *śṛṅga-m*). Neuter *i*- and *u*-stems form their nominatives without *s* not only in Sanskrit, but also in Germanic, cf. prim. Germ. *marī* (in Goth. *mari-saiws*), Goth. *faihu*: Lat. *pecu* (Skt. *pśū*).

The accusative ending *-m* was present in Germanic with the same restrictions as in Sanskrit; but in historical forms it has changed into *-n* or disappeared altogether. This *-m* of accusative in the form of *-n* is found in Goth. *þan-a* (Skt. *tām*). Similarly runic *staina* < **stainan* < **stainam*; Goth. *tunþu* < **tunþum* < I.-E. **dónt-m*; Ags. *duru* < **dhurm*, etc. It is important to note that dissyllabic consonantal stems did not change the ending *-m* to *-um* (as above). Thus I.-E. **bhrāter-m* > prim. Germ. **brōþēr-n* > Goth. *brōþar* (same as in nominative).† Gothic accusative forms like *fadar*, *mēnōþ*, *weitwōd* have evidently lost a final *m* and not *m̥* (which would have developed into *um*). Some monosyllabic consonant-stems too, on the other hand, seem to have taken the ending *-m* instead of *-m̥*; cf. Goth. *baúrg*, *naht*, in accusative. I.-E. *o*-stems had an instrumental in *-ō*; cf. Skt. *vyākā*, Gr. *pō-pote*. This instrumental ending is in evidence in O.H.G. *tagu wortu* < **dagō* **wortō*. I.-E. *ā*-stems (=Germ. *ō*-stems) had moreover an endingless form in instr. sing., cf. Skt. *doṣā*. For this too we have corresponding forms in Germanic; cf. O.H.G. *gēbu* < **gēbō*; O.N. *flōdr* < **fedru* < *febrō*.—Germanic dative is nothing but the Indo-European locative in *-i*. But this *i* has phonologically disappeared in the second syllable, though after modifying the root-vowel in Nordic and Anglo-Saxon. Thus prim. Germ. **fadri* (Gr. *patri*): Goth. *fadr*: O.N. *fedr*; prim. Germ. **manni*: Goth. *mann*: Ags. *men*. In trisyllabic forms however the ending was dropped so early that the root-vowel was not modified in their case in these two dialects. In the case of I.-E. *e/o*-stems the prim. Germanic locative ending should have been as in **dagē-i* (> **dag-i* > Ags. *dægi*) or **dago-i* (> **dagai* > O.H.G. *tage*). The dative ending *-ai* of Indo-European femi-

* A different view is expressed by Kieckers, Handbuch der vergleichenden gotischen Grammatik, pp. 119, 126.

nine *ā*-stems is clearly in evidence in Gothic *gibai* : Ags. *ȝife*. Indo-European ablative ending *-ēd* (cf. Skt. *paśc-āt*), which through *-ēt* became *-ē* in primitive Germanic, can still be traced in Gothic pronominal forms such as *þē*, *hōē*, *hammē-h*.

In genitive singular the Germanic languages show various endings, but never *-sya*. We find here primarily an *-s* out of *-so* (cf. O. Ch. Sl. *če-so*), which originally should have been a pronominal ending; thus Goth. *dagis* (< **dagasa*): O.N. *dags*; O.H.G. *tages*. Beside it the I.-E. genitive ending *es/os* too can be clearly perceived in Germanic; cf. O.H.G. *naht-es*, *mann-es*. All *n*-stems of primitive Germanic formed their genitive with *-iz* (< I.-E. **-es*), of which the element *i* was dropped very early in trisyllabic forms; thus prim. Germ. **hananiz* > **hananz* > Goth. *hanins* : O.H.G. *henin*. In gen. sg. the *r*-stems were perhaps endingless in Germanic as in Sanskrit (cf. Skt. *bhrātūr* from *bhrātár*); thus O.N. *brōþur*, Ags. *brōþur* (but Goth. *brōþrs*).

In nominative plural the I.-E. ending *-es*=Germ. *-iz* is clearly in evidence in runic *dohtriR*; prim. Germ. **fōtiz* (Gr. *pódes*) can still be recognised through Ags. *fēt* of which the root-vowel has been modified to *ē* by the *i* of the original ending. But this *i*-umlaut cannot be perceived in Western Germanic in the case of disyllabic consonant-stems, for there the vowel of the third syllable was dropped very early; thus early Germ. **mēnōþ-iz* : Ags. *mōnað*. The I.-E. ending *-ns*, (> *-nz* in prim. Germ.) in accusative plural after vowel-stems can be clearly perceived in Goth. *dagans gastins sununs*; after consonants however this ending phonologically developed into *-uns*, cf. Goth. *brōþr-uns wintr-uns*. In Northern and Western Germanic the acc. pl. has mostly coincided with the nom. pl.—The original Germanic ending in dat. pl. was *-miz* (see LIS., pp. 16–17), and it is retained by at least one Gothic form, viz. *twaimiz* (=Skt. *dvā-bhyām*). But as most of the forms in dat. pl. were of three syllables or more, the ending *-miz* was early contracted into *-mz* (> *-m*); hence Goth. *dagam sunum* etc. in dat. pl.—The original Germanic ending in gen. pl. was *-ēm* (an ablaut-form of *-ōm*, see LIS., p. 40) which phonologically lost its nasal element in early Germanic. Hence the Gothic ending *-ē* in *dagē*, *brōþrē*.

Germanic pronominal flexion has retained all the specifically Indo-European features, and it is a striking innovation of Germanic that adjectives here took largely after the pronouns in declension. In dat. sg. masc. neut. we have in Gothic the pronominal ending *-mma* (cf. *þamma imma*) which is a reduced form of older **zmē*, the final long vowel of which is still preserved in forms whose finals are protected by enclitic particles (cf. *hammē-hun* etc.). This **zmē* (assimilated into *-mmē*) is the direct descendant of the I.-E. pronominal ending *-smēd* (> Skt. *-smāt*). On the evidence of Ags. *þære* and O.N. *þeire*,

the corresponding feminine form in primitive Germanic should have been **ḡaizai* which is in full agreement with Skt. *tasyāi*. Similarly O.N. *ḡeirar* presupposes a genitive form **ḡaizjoz* which fully corresponds to Skt. *īasyāḥ*. The corresponding Gothic forms *ḡizai ḡizōs*, though clearly reminiscent of these forms, are difficult to reconcile with them without the assumption of an otherwise unwarranted sound-mutation *zj > z*.—The Indo-European neuter pronominal ending *-d* (Skt. *tā-d* etc.) has been preserved in Goth. *ḡat-a*, *it-a*, protected by the enclitic particle. A guttural pronominal enclitic of Indo-European origin (cf. Skt. *tvām ha*, Gr. *emé ge*) is to be found in Goth. *mi-k* to which corresponds mod. Germ. *mich*.

This essentially Indo-European pronominal declension profoundly influenced the declension of adjectives in Germanic—which is the reason why adjectivess often take weak flexion in modern German (e.g. “des guten Mannes”). From the Gothic adjective stem *blind-* “blind” we have in dat. sg. masc. *blindamma* after *ḡamma*, and in acc. sg. masc. *blindana* after *ḡana*; in dat. pl. masc. *blindaim* after *ḡaim*; gen. sg. fem. *blindaižōs* after *ḡizōs*; neut. *blindata* after *ḡata*, etc. The process of assimilating the declension of adjectives to that of pronouns was carried on still further in Old High German.

We have now to discuss the history of the Indo-European verbal system as it developed within Germanic. Compared with Sanskrit or Greek, the Germanic verbal system makes a very poor show indeed, for the early Germans had mercifully simplified the extremely complex Indo-European verbal system. Yet with regard to *Aktionsart* (see LIS., p. 147), Germanic gives us valuable information about the Indo-European verbal system, though only two verbal *aspects* can be clearly distinguished here, viz., the perfective aspect (attaching to verbs of the type “to find”) and the imperfective aspect (attaching to verbs of the type “to see”). The prefix *ga-* is used in Gothic to accentuate the perfective aspect of verbal roots; thus *rinnan* “to run” but *ga-rinnan* “to reach by running,” *ḡraithnan* “to ask” but *ga-ḡraithnan* “to establish by enquiry,” etc.

So far as thematic stem-formation of the verb is concerned, it is quite clear that in Germanic too as in Sanskrit the *bhū*-class overshadowed all the other root-classes, and in course of time all the other root-classes gradually went over to the *bhū*-class. Roots of this class being radically accented (*bhāva-ti*) are easily recognisable in Gothic by surd spirants in root-final (Verner’s Law). Thus Goth. *teiha*, *leiḡa*, *reisa*, *filha* etc. are all verbs from roots of the *bhū*-class. Verbs of Sanskrit *tud*-class too are easily recognisable in Germanic—e.g. Goth. *trud-an*, in which the sonant root-ending *d* clearly shows that the seat of accent must have been on the following thematic vowel, and the reduced-grade form of the root in which clearly reminds us of Skt. *tud-ā-ti*. But already in primitive Germanic verbs of the *tud*-class were transferred to the

bhū-class ; thus Skt. *juṣāmi*, but Goth. *kiusa* which shows the effect of radical accent.

Germanic roots show all the chief nasal suffixes of Sanskrit, though not necessarily the same root the same nasal suffix both in Sanskrit and Germanic. Thus the Germanic root corresponding to Skt. *ṛcchāmi* shows a nasal suffix in Gothic (*fraihnan*) which is in evidence in Skt. *mṛṇāmi* etc. When the nasal suffix consisted merely of *n* it was simply incorporated into the root in Germanic ; thus Goth. *skei-n-an* from *skei-* (cf. Goth. *skei-ma*, *skei-rs*), O.H.G. *swinan* from *swi-* (cf. Ags. *swī-ma*). All verbal stems in *ll* and *nn* (e.g. Goth. *wallan spinnan*) might have been originally roots with the suffix *-n*. There is no clear trace in Germanic of roots with infixed nasal (type : Skt. *muñcāmi*) ; thus Goth. *tahja* against Skt. *damśāmi*.—Germanic verbs with the present-suffix *-īo-* (type : Skt. *dṛvyā-mi*) are quite common, and their radical accent too is betrayed by the forms in question ; cf. Goth. *ḡairsja* : Skt. *tṛṣyā-mi*, Goth. *da-ddjan* : Skt. *dhāyā-mi* etc.—On the other hand, there is no clear trace in Germanic of reduplicating thematic presents of the type Gr. *gignōskō* etc.

The various athematic presents too have left behind clear traces in Germanic. The Indo-European athematic root **es-* shows the same striking ablaut-forms in Germanic as in Sanskrit ; thus Goth. *is-t s-ind* corresponding to Skt. *ās-ti s-ānti*. The characteristic ending *-mi* of this flexion in first pers. sing. is also clearly preserved in Germanic ; cf. O.H.G. *gēm* < **ga-īmi* : Skt. *ēmi* ; O.H.G. *stām* < I.-E. **sthāmi* ; Ags. *cyme* : Skt. *gān-mi* (but Goth. *qima*) ; Ags. *swēfan* : Skt. *svāpimi*, etc.—Reduplicating athematic presents of the type Skt. *ju-hó-mi* are still perceptible in Germanic ; cf. O.H.G. *bi-bē-t* : Skt. *bi-bhé-ti*, O.H.G. *se-stō-t* < I.-E. **st-sthā-ti*, etc.—We have only faint traces of the athematic nasal presents of the type Skt. *krī-ṇā-mi* ; cf. Goth. *kun-nu-m* : Skt. *jā-nī-māh*. Some of the most important I.-E. athematic roots with the suffix *-nā* have gone over to the normal *bhū*-type in Germanic ; thus Skt. *badh-nā-mi*, but O.H.G. *bindan* (like Avestan *bandāmi*, from the same Indo-European root). The same transfer to the main thematic type is in evidence also in the case of Indo-European athematic verbs with the suffix *nu* : *no* (type : Skt. *sunóti*) ; thus Skt. *stighnóti* but Goth. *steiga*. Athematic nasal presents of the type *ruṇāddhi* have in the same way been robbed of their root-suffix in Germanic, thus Skt. *riṇākti* but Goth. *leiḡa*.

Coming now to the perfect-system, the first thing we have to note is that reduplication as a principle of perfect-formation has been mostly given up in Germanic. Corresponding to Skt. *bibhēda vavārta sasāda* we have therefore in Gothic simply *bait warḡ sat*. The shift of accent among congeneric perfect forms (*bibhēda* : *bibhidūh*) is however revealed in Germanic by grammatical alternance ; cf. Goth. *aīh* : *aigum*, *ḡarf* : *ḡaurbum*, O.H.G. *sneid* : *snitum*,

zōh : *zugum*, etc. Though tempting, it is not permissible to connect these unreduplicating perfect forms with Skt. *pet-á-tuḥ* etc., for the latter may be explained as an entirely internal phenomenon of Sanskrit (see LIS., p. 79). Otherwise, however, they would have to be regarded as a striking common Indo-Germanic innovation.—As examples of Germanic reduplicating perfects may be mentioned Gothic *aukan* : *ai auk*, *haldan* : *hai hald*, *haitan* : *hai hait*, *hōpan* : *hai hōp* etc. The vowel *e* (written *ai*) of the reduplication syllable in these forms is clearly of Indo-European antiquity (see LIS., p. 37). If the verb begins with consonant+*l*, *r*, then only the first consonant is reduplicated in Gothic, cf. Goth. *sai-slēp* *gai-grōt* from *slēpan* “to sleep” and *grētan* “to weep” respectively (Streitberg, p. 148). Analogous phenomena also in Skt. *śi-slēṣ-a* from *śliṣ-*, *su-srāv-a* from *sru-*. But the whole initial group is repeated in Gothic if it is *sk* or *st*; cf. *af-skai-skaid*, *ga-stai-stald* (Jellinek, § 186).

Augment-tenses have lost the augment in Germanic (with the exception of the aorist form Goth. *iddja* <prim. Germ. **i* *l̥l̥ēd* < I.-E. **é-₁-ē-t* > Skt. *āyāt*). The purpose of the augment is served in Germanic by a dental suffix of unknown origin which serves to form weak preterites.† In modern Germanic languages the verbs forming their preterites with this dental suffix (cf. Engl. *heard*, Germ. *hörte* etc.) are called *weak* as opposed to *strong* verbs whose preterites are derived from unreduplicating Germanic perfects discussed above (Goth. *warþ sat* etc.). The dental suffix of the weak preterite is a striking innovation of the Germanic verbal system. Some Germanic roots partake of the characteristics of both strong and weak verbs; thus Goth. *bringan* : *brahta*, O.H.G. *biginnan* : *bigonta* etc.—It may be mentioned in passing that in primitive Germanic there were quite a number of preterital presents of the type Skt. *véda* < I.-E. **uoida*; thus we have in Gothic *kann þarf skal mag* etc.

Subjunctive is the most important mood after the indicative, but it has completely disappeared in Germanic. The optative however is still clearly recognisable by its characteristic suffix *-oi* (see LIS., p. 158); cf. Goth. *bairais bairaiþ* : Skt. *bhāreḥ bhāreta*.—As for imperative, there is no trace in Germanic of the ending *-dhi* in 2. pers. sg. of the athematic conjugation. Curiously enough, the Sanskrit imperative ending *-u* seems to be preserved in some Gothic imperative forms of the third person singular and plural like *at-steigadau*, *liugandau* (see LIS., p. 39). It is evidently this same *-au* which is in evidence in all the quotable forms of passive optative in Gothic. Cf. singular first and third persons *haitaidau*, second person *haitaizau*; plural first and third persons *bigitaindau*, second person *fragimaindau* (Jellinek, § 183).

†It is usually held that this dental suffix is the remnant of I.-E. *dhē-* (Skt. *dhā-*) supposed to have been used periphrastically in primitive Germanic to express past tense.

Germanic personal endings have either disappeared phonologically or been very much reduced, but, as the forms quoted in course of this chapter will clearly show, they faithfully continue the Indo-European tradition. The fuller passive endings have been naturally best preserved, e.g. Goth. *-za -da -nda* corresponding to Skt. *-se -te -nte*. Thus to Skt. *bhāre bhārase bhārate bhārante* should have corresponded in primitive Germanic **berai *berazai *beradai* and **berandai*.

MISCELLANEA

(1)

TAXILA CASKET INSCRIPTION OF KANIṢKA RECONSIDERED

This inscription is engraved on a relic casket found by Spooner during the course of excavations at Shāh-ji-kī Dheri in 1908-1909. It was first edited by him in *An. Rep., A.S.I.*, 1908-09, pp. 51 & ff., and later on by Prof. Sten Konow in *C.I.I.*, Vol. II. Pt. I. p. 137. Despite the editing of this inscription by these two eminent scholars the record is still susceptible of a better interpretation.

Spooner edited the inscription in different and almost disconnected bits.

Ačaryana[m] Sarvastivadina[m] pratigrahe.

"For the acceptance of the doctors of the Sarvāstivādin sect."

Deyadharmo Sarvasattvana[m] hidasuhartha[m] bhavatu.

"May this pious gift abound to the welfare and happiness of all beings."

*Dasa Agisāla navakarmi Kanaṣkasa vihare Mahasenasa Saṃgha-
rame.*

"The slave (or servant) Agisāla, the overseer of works at Kaniṣka's vihāra in the saṃghārāma of Mahāsēna."

Prof. Sten Konow's Text :

L. 1 Saṃ [I ma] [haraja*] sa Kani(ṇi) [ṣkasa]. imaṇa(na)g(r)ar[e]
[dha] . . g(r)aryaka.

L. 2 deyadharme Sarvastvana[m] (ṇaṃ) hidasuhartha[m] bha-
vatu.

L. 3 dasa Agisāla ṇa(na)vakarmia [Ka]ne(ṇe)ṣkasa vihare Maha-
sena(ṇa)sa saṃgharame.

L. 4 acharyana(ṇa) sarvastivatina(ṇa) pratigrahe.

Translation.

In the year 1 of (the mahārāja) Kaniṣka, in the town ima, connect-
ed with the . . . mansion, this religious gift—may it be for the welfare
and happiness of all beings—the slave Agisāla was the architect,—in
Kaniṣka's Vihāra, in Mahāsēna's Saṃghārāma, in the acceptance of
the Sarvāstivādin teacher.

With due respect to Prof. Sten Konow there is no good *anvaya*
in his interpretation also. It is better therefore to translate the in-
scription by dividing it into the following sentences :

- L. 1. Saṃ [1 ma] [haraja] sa Kaṇi[ṣkasa] ima nag(r)are[e]
[dha] .. g(r)aryaka.
2. deyadharme sarvastvaṇa[m] hidasuhartha[m] bhavatu
[1*].
L. 3. dasa Agiśala ṇa(na)vakarmia[1*] [Ka]ṇeṣkasa vihare Ma-
hasenasa saṃgharame [1*].
4. acaryaṇa Sarvastivatiṇa pratigrahe [1*].

Translation.

In the year 1 (is) the religious benefaction of Mahārāja Kaniṣka in this town, which may be for the welfare and happiness of all beings.

(The words immediately following Kaniṣka are so badly preserved as to give no connected sense).

Slave Agesilaos was the architect for the temple (*vihāra*) of Kaniṣka in the Monastic Establishment (*saṃghārāma*) of Mahāsena. (*This is*) a gift to the Sarvāstivādin teachers.

In view of this translation some words in the inscription require explanation.

Navakarmia.—Spooner has translated *Navakarmi* as “the overseer of works” at Kaniṣka’s *Vihāra*, while Prof. Sten Konow, who takes the word as *Navakarmika* translates it as meaning ‘an architect.’ Here it is desirable to point out the occurrence of this word in two other Kharoṣṭhī records. In the Taxila Copper Plate Inscription of Patika, Rohiṇimitra is mentioned as a *Navakamika*=*Navakarmika*, while the Hidda inscription mentions the name of Saṃghamitra as a *Navakarmika* (*Saṃghamitreṇa navakarmiena*). Either translation is satisfactory.

Parigrahe or *Pratigrahe*.—Spooner had at first read it as *Pratigrahe*. According to lexicons, the word should mean a ‘gift.’ But what was the gift of Kaniṣka? Was it the casket or the place where it was deposited, namely a *Stūpa*? If it is taken in the sense of a gift of casket, naturally we are taking it in a very narrow sense. This would not clear up the meaning of *Navakarmika*. It should therefore be taken in the wider sense of a *Stūpa*, which seems to have been constructed by Kaniṣka for the Sarvāstivādins. Thus the slave Agesilaos was the architect for the construction of this *Stūpa*.

In coming to the conclusion, two other points deserve consideration. The first is the distinction between a *vihāra* and a *saṃghārāma*. According to Kern, *vihāra*, as a rule, denoted a temple where worship was conducted, while *saṃghārāma* was always a Monastic Establishment. Therefore it would appear that the temple was already erected by Kaniṣka for the Sarvāstivādin teachers. The construction of the *Stūpa* where the casket was enshrined is the gift of Kaniṣka specified in this record.

In this very inscription, there appear to be two forms of Kaniska, one with *ikāra* and the other with *ekāra*. The Kaniska who constructed the Viḥāra is mentioned as Kaneṣka but the donor of the Stūpa is mentioned as Kaniska. Were there two Kaniskas? Possibly not.

The second question relates to the identification of Mahāsena. Who was this Mahāsena? In the inscription he is credited with the construction of a Saṅghārāma or Monastic Establishment. Was he the same Mahāsena who is identified with king Pradyota of Avanti, a contemporary of Buddha and Ajātaśatru? Did he establish a Buddhist monastery at Taxila, just as Anāthapiṇḍika did the Jetavana at Śrāvastī?

These are the queries on which I hope eminent Buddhist scholars like Drs. B. M. Barua, B. C. Law and N. Dutt, would come forward to throw some light.

BAIJ NATH PURI

(2)

KĀKAVARṆA, KING OF MAGADHA

Prof. H. C. Raychaudhuri drew the attention of scholars to an interesting story, referring to Pratihāra Bhoja of Kanauj, in the Vastrāpatha-māhātmya section of the *Skanda-Purāṇa*.¹ It was pointed out that the details of the story, as in other priestly legends, belong to the domain of fairy tales and are absolutely unhistorical; on careful examination, however, the Professor discovered three grains of historical truth underneath the above details.

Careful examination may lead to similar results with regard to some other Purāṇic stories. As I am trying to show in the present note, a story in the *Brhaddharma-Purāṇa* (Bangabāsi ed., Madhyakhāṇḍa, ch. 26) appears to refer to Kākavarṇa, a pre-Mauryan king of Magadha, who is represented in the genealogical sections of the *Purāṇas* as the son and successor of Śiśunāga. The story is given in the following verses :—

कीकटे नाम देशोऽस्ति काककर्णख्यको नृपः ।

प्रजानां हितकृन्नित्यं ब्रह्मद्वेषकरस्तथा ॥ 20

1. I.H.Q., March, 1929, p. 129ff.; *Studies in Indian Antiquities*, p. 146 ff.

तस्य धर्मकथा विप्र कर्णे वजायते द्विज ।
 रजसा तमसाविष्टः सततं स नृपेश्वरः ॥ 21
 तत्र देशे गया नाम पुण्यदेशोऽस्ति विश्रुतः ।
 नदी च कर्णदा नाम पितृणां स्वर्गदायिनी ॥
 तद्विक्पराङ्मुखो राजा न कोऽपि च प्रयाति वै ॥ 22
 अथ तत्र वणिक्कश्चित् तस्य दर्शनमागतः ।
 गङ्गास्नानरतः साधुर्गङ्गास्नानसमन्वितः ॥ 23
 स वै बहुधनं तस्मै ददौ भूपाय वै वणिक् ।
 तेन तस्य सह प्रीतिर्गङ्गास्नानविरोधकृत् ॥
 वणिक् सोऽपि नृपप्रीत्या तत्र वासं चकार ह ॥ 24
 तद्वर्षाभ्यन्तरे तस्य काककर्णस्य भूपतेः ।
 महादाहज्वरात्तस्य मृत्युकालो ह्युपस्थितः ॥ 25
 तदा स वणिजं दृष्ट्वा राजा परमनारितकः ।
 रुरोद तस्य विच्छेददुःखाप्यनुभवन् बहु ॥ 26

काककर्ण उवाच ।

सखे वणिङ्महाभाग म्रियेऽहं नात्र संशयः ।
 त्वं मे सुताञ्छिशून् राज्यं समृद्धं बलवत्तरम् ॥ 27
 पायाद्यथा त्वया त्यक्तो याम्यहं मरणं प्रभो ।
 त्वं मे सुहृत् सखावन्धुर्विश्वास्यः सर्वकर्मसु ॥ 28, etc. etc.

The points that appear to be interesting in this story are :—

- (1) the peculiar name of the king who ruled over Kīkaṭa (=Magadha) comprising the Gayā region ;
- (2) his description as प्रजानां हितकृन्नित्यं (one who always does good to his subjects), but also as ब्रह्मद्वेषकर (a hater of the Brāhmaṇas) and परमनारितक (a great non-believer);
- (3) his great concern at his deathbed for his kingdom and his minor sons ;
- (4) appointment of a friend to protect his kingdom and sons after his death.

We know from the Purāṇic lists that Śiśunāga was succeeded on the throne of Magadha by his son Kākavarṇa who appears to have

been called Kālāśoka in the Ceylonese chronicles and Kākavarṇin in the *Aśokāvadāna*. He was a Buddhist, and the second Buddhist Council of Vaiśālī was probably held during his reign. He is also said to have transferred the capital from Rājagṛha to Pāṭaliputra. According to the Ceylonese chronicles, he was succeeded by his ten sons who are supposed to have ruled simultaneously.² Bāṇa, in his *Harṣacarita* (Parab's ed., p. 199), says that Kākavarṇa, son of Śiśunāga, was found with a dagger thrust into his throat in the vicinity of his city. The story of the tragic end of the king is supposed to be confirmed by the evidence of the classical writers. According to Curtius, the last Nanda king's father "was in fact a barber, scarcely staving off hunger by his daily earnings, but who from his being not uncomely in person had gained the affections of the queen, and was by her influence, advanced to too near a place in the confidence of the reigning monarch. Afterwards, however, he treacherously murdered his sovereign and then, under the pretence of acting as guardian to the royal children, usurped the supreme authority, and having put the young princes to death, begot the present king." This murdered king is supposed to have been Kākavarṇa—Kālāśoka.³

Kākakarṇa, the name of the king in the story of the *Bṛhaddharma-Purāṇa*, may no doubt be a clerical mistake for Kākavarṇa. Students of the Purāṇas know that there are numerous variant readings of the same name not only in the different Purāṇas, but also in different manuscripts of the same Purāṇa. The reference to Kākakarṇa's rule over Kīkaṭa which is another early name of the Magadha region,⁴ and to his anti-Brahmanical leanings that may be interpreted as due to his Buddhist faith, suggests this king's identification with the celebrated Kākavarṇa-Śiśunāgi of Magadha. The anxiety he felt for his kingdom and minor sons before death and the appointment of a friend as the protector of both his kingdom and children again appear to be an echo of the actual facts hinted at by Bāṇa and the Classical writers. The "barber" mentioned in the Classical version of the story seems to have been called a "merchant" in the story of the *Bṛhaddharma-Purāṇa*.

DINES CHANDRA SIRCAR.

2. This may refer to the fact that they were minors.

3. Raychaudhuri, *Political History of Ancient India*, 4th ed., pp. 180-81, 187. After the preparation of this note, I have noticed that the story of Kākakarṇa has been referred to in the same work, p. 95.

4. *Studies in Indian Antiquities*, p. 18.

REVIEWS

THE MAHABHARATA, UDYOGAPARVAN (2), Critically edited by Sushil Kumar De ; Poona, Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1940.

In this fascicule Dr. S. K. De has completed the Udyogaparvan of the Poona edition of the Mahābhārata which has justly come to occupy the highest place among the publications made in India in connection with oriental research. The designation "fascicule" ill suits a volume of 340 quarto pages of text and supplements excluding a long and very instructive introduction of over 50 pages. If this "fascicule," what is then "fascis"?

Adhering to the policy laid down by the General Editor, Dr. De has "avoided *emendations* as far as possible, there being...only 7 altogether in the entire text," and the *lectio difficilior* has throughout been justly given preference where other things are equal. The text thus reconstructed with meticulous care reveals many interesting facts. It proves, for instance, that the hiatus was by no means an unwelcome feature in epic verse, but from the editor's remark it is not clear whether the hiatus was allowed by preference within pādas or between them. Dr. De has pointed out two cases of metrical shortening: even in the Ṛgveda metrical shortening is of such rare occurrence that one might be inclined to think that in the epic period there was perhaps some sort of *grammatical* support as well for these two cases, viz. *gaṅgāyamunaṣaṅgame* and *pādāṅguṣṭhāgradhiṣṭhitā*. In the latter case, at all events, the prefix might have been *dhi* instead of *adhi*:—In view of the fact that the dative and the genitive had got much mixed up in the Brāhmaṇa-period, the form *rādhāyāḥ* in 5. 139. 5 should perhaps be regarded as an archaism.

Dr. De's critical estimate of the various recensions and commentaries based on laborious collation and comparison will wring admiration even from flintiest of critics.

BATAKRISHNA GHOSH.

DVIPAMAYA-BHARATA (Bengali), by Sunitikumar Chatterji, pp. 396, Calcutta 1940. Published by Book Company Ltd.

Twelve years ago, as a young man just out of teens, I read with avidity and interest Prof. Chatterji's chronicle of travels in insular India with Dr. Rabindranath Tagore which he then published in pieces in the various Bengali journals of Calcutta. Now Prof. Chatterji has brought out those scattered articles in a beautiful volume which, I am sure, will be treasured as one of the best books in Bengali produced in this century. As a travel-book it is indeed

unique in our literature. When reading it I was constantly reminded of Keyserling's famous dictum : *der Weg zu sich liegt die Welt herum*. It is easy to see that these travels have helped Prof. Chatterji to find his own self. Like a true artist that he is in spite of his profound scholarship, Prof. Chatterji was deeply moved by all that he saw. But his personal culture is so deeply rooted in the glorious traditions of India that his colourful experiences though adding new hues to his powerful mind could not in any way shake its foundations. Naturally, Prof. Chatterji's book is utterly unlike those nauseating publications by men who spend their days in India with a telescope in hand, pointed towards Europe,—which it is their usual practice to discard in favour of a microscope if by any chance they can manage to pass the Suez Canal! The accounts published by these unconscious humourists always remind me of Count Smorltork immortalised by Dickens.—Since the book is written by its author it contains a mass of useful information about the art, archæology, history and languages of India and Greater India presented in an attractive form. Altogether the book is delightful.

BATAKRISHNA GHOSH.

STUDIES IN THE PURĀNIC RECORDS ON HINDU RITES AND CUSTOMS, by R. C. Hazra, pp. VII+367; published by the University of Dacca (Bulletin No. XX), 1940.

This is one of those few books which come—to stay. An enormous amount of labour and research has gone into the making of this book which even an adverse critic—if there is any—must respectfully recognise. The subject so ably handled by the author, a worthy pupil of Dr. S. K. De, is truly fascinating. The Purāṇas have hitherto been utilised chiefly for dynastic chronology, though the chief reason why the Purāṇas were shunned in the other fields of Indology was the absence of any dependable chronology of the Purāṇas themselves! To go to his job Dr. Hazra therefore had to establish at first a dependable chronology of each Purāṇa and this he has done literally by chapter and verse. In this way the author came to the conclusion that the Purāṇas on the whole reflect the Indian society of about 200 A.D.—In estimating the real value of Purāṇic evidence however I must differ from the author on some essential points. The corpus of the Purāṇas arose, it is true, in a period of chaos as Dr. Hazra has amply demonstrated. But should not the author have made it clear that in bewailing the infringement of the Varṇāśramadharma the Purāṇic authors were breaking their hearts over a thing that had never existed? In the Vedic period the Varṇāśramadharma as popularly understood did not exist. In the age of the Upaniṣads the Kṣatriyas used to teach the Brāhmaṇas. And after the rise of

Buddhism we find in India a fluid and mobile class-system masquerading as Varnadharma. There is nothing to prove that the Varnadharma was ever more rigorously enforced than the Āśramadharma which for all practical purposes existed in theory alone.—This is, however, by the way. I have learnt much from this book. But I hope to learn more from other publications of Dr. Hazra on the same subject.

BATAKRISHNA GHOSH.

A HITTITE GLOSSARY; words of known or conjectured meaning with Sumerian and Akkadian words occurring in Hittite texts by Edgar H. Sturtevant; second edition, Linguistic Society of America, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia 1936; pp. 192.

We have not even begun Hittite studies in India. But the best talents in other countries are being more and more drawn towards this branch of Linguistics. Professor Sturtevant is an outstanding example of this new movement. His "Comparative Grammar of the Hittite Language" (1933) is recognised as the best text book on Hittite linguistics all over the world. In the preface to this Comparative Grammar Prof. Sturtevant promised two more volumes: one consisting of an etymological and comparative treatment of the indeclinable words and an essay on syntax, and the other of texts in cuneiform characters, with transliteration, translation, commentary and vocabulary. These two volumes, so far as I know, have not yet appeared,—at least they have not reached India. Prof. Sturtevant has apparently thought it more necessary to prepare a revised edition of his Hittite Glossary. In his own words, it is "primarily an index to the literature about Hittite words." The importance of such a book on a branch of Linguistics still in its formative stage cannot be overestimated, though in India we have access to only a small part of the source-books (mostly periodicals) referred to. It is to be hoped however that this book will awaken adequate interest in Hittite studies in India.

BATAKRISHNA GHOSH.

BIBLIOGRAPHIE BOUDDHIQUE, VII-VIII (Mai 1934 Mai 1936) par A. J. Bernet Kempers and others. Rétrospective: L'oeuvre complet the Sylvain Lévi; Bibliographie par Maurice Maschino, Index par Nadine Stchoupak. Paris 1937.

The "Bibliographie Bouddhique" requires no introduction to Orientalists to-day, for every serious student of Buddhism must have it at his elbow. A special feature of the present volume is that it gives a complete bibliography

of the publications of the late Prof. Sylvain Lévi bearing on Buddhism. It will be an irreparable loss to science if due to the unstable conditions now prevailing in Europe the publication of this very useful bibliography were stopped.

BATAKRISHNA GHOSH.

DOCTRINE OF ŚAKTI IN INDIAN LITERATURE, by the late Dr. Prabhat Chandra Chakravarti, pp. 123, Calcutta 1940.

This is an incomplete work by the late Professor Chakravarti. The term *śakti* as used in the Indian philosophical literature signifies "potency." This "potency" was at the root of the *sathkāryavāda* of the Sāṅkhyas. But the Buddhists too, who to the last held fast to the doctrine of instantaneous annihilation, believed in *śakti*, and they refused to accept space as entity on the ground that space has not the "potency" to produce effective action (*arthakriyā*). The anomaly of their position became still more obvious when under the hammer-blows of the Mīmāṃsakas and the Naiyāyikas they had to confess to a "residue" (*anuśaya*) of the annihilated *kṣaṇa*—thus in a way going back to the old *sathkāryavāda*. To less heroic spirits causality appeared to be so utterly inexplicable and mysterious that they sought refuge in *śaktivāda*, the nearest Indian parallel to Bergson's *élan vital*. Prof. Chakravarti intended to investigate in detail this *śaktivāda* in the philosophical literature of India. But death snatched him away before he could finish his work.

BATAKRISHNA GHOSH.

KAPPHINĀBHYUDAYA, A MAHĀKĀVYA OF SIVASVĀMIN, critically edited by Gauri Shankar, M.A., B. Litt. (Oxon), Lecturer, Government College, Lahore, and published by the University of the Punjab; pp. lxxxviii+165+xviii; 1937.

We extend our congratulations to the editor on his presenting the public with a typical Mahākāvya coming from the pen of the talented Kashmirian Sivasvāmin who flourished under the patronage of King Avantīvarman of Kashmir who reigned between 855 and 883 A.D. Some stray verses of the work were known from some anthologies and a few quotations. This was the only information about the treatise. But thanks to the untiring endeavour of Dr. Shankar the text has been critically edited after collation of several MSS. and transcripts. The content bespeaks the amount of sincere labour he has spent over the volume.

Sivasvāmin was a Hindu belonging possibly to the Śaivite sect as can be inferred from his Praśasti (XX. 45) where he dedicates his Kāvya to the God

Śiva. He was considerably influenced by the Buddhistic philosophy as is discernible in his use of the Buddhist nomenclature and philosophical concepts in the work itself. For instance, he introduces the Pratītya-samutpāda of the Buddhists in the concluding canto. He draws upon a legend of the Buddhistic lore, viz. Avadānaśataka, but ultimately Hinduises the theme in that his Buddha does not instantly invite the vanquished king to enter the fold of his creed but directs him to discharge his royal duties desirelessly. This is nothing but enjoining the Karma-yoga of the Bhagavad-Gītā. Dr. Keith is evidently wrong when he says that the author was a Buddhist, and therefore chose a legend from the Avadānaśataka (Classical Sanskrit Literature, p. 60).

The following is the story of the Avadānaśataka couched in 20 cantos here. Kapphiṇa, the king of Līlāvātī, a town on the Vindhya, is seated in council when a spy visits him with the information that Prasenajit, the ruler of Kośala, has grown hostile towards him. Then sits a council of war where as many as 41 vassal chiefs participate in the debate. The decision favours a concerted action against Prasenajit, but before that an envoy is sent to him so that he may read their intention beforehand. At this stage occurs a digression from the main thread of the story which proves helpful to the poet. A Vidyādhara friend of Kapphiṇa invites and accompanies him to the Malaya where the big royal party amuses itself by various merriments. The messenger arrives in Kośala and pleads before the king to submit to Kapphiṇa. But Prasenajit, enraged at his words, rejects his proposal in contempt and speaks out his decision that he will rather meet Kapphiṇa in the battlefield. The messenger returns to Līlāvātī and delivers the message to the king. The king marches immediately against Prasenajit. Several rounds of battle are fought between the two armies. Prasenajit takes to eulogise the Buddha when he loses all hope of victory. The latter works miracles successfully to subdue Kapphiṇa. Canto xix consists of the praise of the Buddha by Kapphiṇa. The whole canto is in a peculiar Prākṛit, rather a mixed form of Sanskrit and Prākṛit, as the editor holds. Nowhere else in any Sanskrit Mahākāvya is to be found a whole Canto composed in Prākṛit. At the conclusion of the story Kapphiṇa is shown to be an ideal king prepared to serve the cause of the Triratna at the exhortation of the Buddha who advises him to wait until the proper time for renunciation comes.

A glance at the treatment of the topic convinces us that Śivasvāmin has closely followed in the footsteps of his predecessors Māgha and Ratnākara, a fact which has been conclusively proved by the editor in his laborious search for parallelisms from the works of these authors, viz. Śiśupālavadha and Hara-vijaya respectively. The poet writes in the artificial epic style like his compeers. His command over the Sanskrit vocabulary can be compared with that of Bāṇabhaṭṭa and Māgha. He successfully handles the different Alaṅkāras, specially Śabdālaṅkāras together with citra-kāvya or picture-poetry of various denominations. No less than 47 varieties of Śabdālaṅkāras have been illustrated, almost all of which are in canto xviii. To suit this special requirement the

poet makes this canto the longest of all. Amongst the Alaṅkāras may be mentioned the Yamakas of various types (e.g. yamaka-pratiloma-bandha, sandaṣṭa-yamaka, samputa-yamaka, mahā-yamaka, etc.), Āvali, Lalita, Muraja-bandha, Kāñcī-bandha, Padma-bandha, Gomutrikā-bandha, and so on. Sometimes he uses only one or two consonants throughout the whole verse. The work as such may be well utilised for the study of Śabdālaṅkāras. The Arthāntara-nyāsas interspersed throughout the Mahākāvya are an unmistakable sign of a master artist who oftentimes soars high in the realm of genuine poetry. The editor has enhanced the value of the work by adding several illustrations of the Citra-Kāvyas at the end. The poet is a gifted metrist. The work is very rich in metrical varieties as it contains not less than 43 metres whereas we know that Māgha has employed 41 metres in all. In the expression 'candramakhaṇḍita' (viii. 41) the poet intentionally drops the Visarga in 'candramah' metri causa.—The work may be profitably studied by all students of the Kāvya literature.

JAGADISH CHANDRA MITRA.

IMPORTANT CONTRIBUTIONS TO ORIENTAL JOURNALS

Annals of Oriental Research of the University of Madras, Vol. IV, part 2.

Vyavahāraśiromaṇiḥ of Śrī-Nārāyaṇa edited by T. R. Chintamani.—The Sanskrit text of the short Nibandha consisting of following sections :—*Vyavahārādi-prakaraṇam, Āvedanakāṇḍaḥ, Vyavahāramāṭṛkāṇḍaḥ, pramāṇakāṇḍaḥ, ṛṇādānaprakaraṇam, nikṣepopanidhiprakāraḥ, sambhūyasa-mutthānam, dattāprādānikam, ajñānasya bhāvarūpatvapratipādanam, and abhāvasamarthanam.*

Women characters in Kālidāsa's Dramas by V. Raghavan.—Excellent appreciation of some of the poet's female characters.

Hindi, High Hindi, Urdu, Dakhini, Hindusthani by S. Muhammad Husayn Nainar.—An authoritative account of the rise and development of Hindi and Urdu.

Place-name suffixes in Tamil by R. P. Sethu Pillai.

Development of the Telugu Language (in Telugu) by K. Ramakrishnaya.

Calcutta Review, Vol. 77, no. 1, October 1940.

History of the Bengali Novel by Srikumar Banerjee.—The author gives a systematic survey of the Bengal Novel from the beginning of the nineteenth century to the present day.

Notions on Purification and Taboo in Society by Bhupendranath Datta.—An ethnological study on superstitions in Egypt, Babylonia, Palestine, Persia, Greece, Rome—and India in particular.

Java in Asiatic History and Culture by Kalidas Nag.—A survey of the archæological work in Java and its bearing on Indian history and culture.

Epigraphia Indica, Vol. XXV, Part IV, October 1939.

Three Copper-plate Grants from Mayurbhanj by R. C. Majumdar : A. Ādipur Copper-plate of Narendrabhaṇjadeva. (Is of great historical importance as it furnishes new materials for the reconstruction of the history of the Bhanja dynasty. "Assuming that the Harṣa era was used, the date of the present Grant would be A.D. 899"). B. Ādipur Copper-plate of Narendrabhaṇjadeva (close copy of A). C. Keśari Copper-plate of Śatrubhaṇjadeva (was first published in IHQ, Vol. XIII, pp. 429 f. and 431).

An Incomplete Grant of Sinda Ādityavarman : Saka 887, by V. V. Mirashi and M. G. Dikshit. A long inscription in good Sanskrit recording grant

of village to the Brāhmaṇa Navaśiva, son of Candrabhaṭṭa, who belonged to the Kauṇḍinyagotra and was a student of the Bāhvr̥ca-śākhās and an émigré from the Madhyadeśa.

Halāyudhastotra from the Amareśvara temple by P. P. Subrahmanya Sastri.

—The whole Halāyudhastotra, the author of which might have been the same person as the renowned commentator on Piṅgala's Chandaḥsūtra, preserved in stone inscription (date A.D. 1063 or 1163).

Two Inscriptions on Copper-plates from Nutimadugu by N. Lakshminarayan Rao.—“The set of plates is a palimpsest containing two records, one, an Eastern Cālukya grant of the 10th century A.D., and the other, which has been engraved over the earlier inscription, of the time of the Vijayanagara prince Triyambaka.”

Indian Historical Quarterly, No. 3, September 1940.

Indo-European in the Mediterranean Area by A. B. Keith.—A brilliant survey of the recent linguistic and achæological discoveries made in the region of eastern Mediterranean without any effort to reach forced conclusion. Rich bibliographical material.

India and the Archæology of Malaysia and Indonesia by Kalidas Nag.—Objective account of archæological and anthropological researches in this area.

The Date of the Sanskrit Inscription of Vo-canḥ (South Annam) by Georges Coedès.—“It is a noteworthy fact that in the linguistic Indianisation of Indo-China neither the Prākritis nor the vernacular languages did play any part.” Author shows that the earliest Skt. inscription of Indo-China should not have been later than the 3rd century A.D.

The oldest Representation of the Śākta Cult in Bengal Art by U. N. Ghosal.—“The Paharpur plaque would be the oldest known representation of the Śākta cult in Bengal” (7th century).

Devices on some Tribal Coins by Jitendra Nath Banerjæa.

A large Hoard of Sātavāhana Coins by V. V. Mirashi.—In this hoard are coins of some Sātavāhana kings whose names were hitherto quite unknown.

Symbols in Early Indian Jewellery by Kalyan Kumar Ganguli.

Proto-Indian Ceramics by S. Srikantha Sastri.—Author has tried to prove that the *viśāḥ asikniḥ* of the R̥gveda were the Sumerians and is tempted to identify the Sobharis with the Subaræans, and concludes that the Harappa culture cannot be brought down to such a late date as 2700 B.C.

Rūpamaṇḍana and the uncommon Forms of Viṣṇu by M. R. Majūmdar.—In the light of the text “Rūpamaṇḍana” (15th century A.D.) the author discusses various forms of the Viṣṇu-image.

Alexander's Invasion of India : a revised Study by Rama Shankar Tripathi.

—Alexander's Indian campaign as reconstructed by the author on strictly

- historical evidence appears in this article in quite a new light.
- The Andhras and their Position in Brāhmaṇical Society by Dines Chandra Sirkar.—Author has tried to explain why the Andhras were assigned a low position in Brahmanical society.
- A New light on the History of the Cāhamānas by D. C. Ganguly.—Author draws attention to the colophon of the book *Viruddha-vidhi-vidhvamsa* (India Office ms.) by Lakṣmīdhara.
- Nilakaṇṭha the Śaiva by Chintaharan Chakravarti.—This Nilakaṇṭha, not the same person as the author of the famous commentary on the Mahābhārata, belonged to the 18th century. He wrote a number commentaries on Purāṇas and Tantras.
- The Authoress Bīnabāyī by J. B. Chaudhuri.—Bīnabāyī lived between the 12th and the 15th century and wrote a *Dvārakā-pattala* (unpublished) on the basis of the *Dvārakā-māhātmya*.
- On the Identity of the two Patañjalis by L. Renou.—Agreeing with Jacobi and differing from Liebich Professor Renou here has proved on grammatical grounds that the author of the Mahābhāṣya could not have been the same person as the author of the Yogasūtra.
- The Arab Conquest of Sind by Sailendra Nath Dhar.—In author's opinion the conquest is not explained by the superstitious beliefs of the conquered, but by the superior military and political power of the Arabs.
- Nature of Indo-Aryan and Indo-Islamic Polity by H. N. Sarma.—In author's opinion, attempts were made in Ancient and Medieval India to dissociate the state from religion and to subordinate the latter to the former.
- A forgotten treaty between Shujauddaulah and the English by Nandalal Chatterji.
- The Ostend Company in Bengal by Kalikinkar Datta.—This Company, floated by the merchants of Flanders and formally chartered in 1772, was permitted by Murshid Quli Jafar Khān to establish a factory at Bankybazār at a distance of fifteen miles from Calcutta.
- Baghaura Nārāyaṇa Image-inscription of Mahīpāla by H. C. Ray. Author discusses the problem of the identity of this Mahīpāla.
- Place of Faith in Buddhism by N. Dutt.
- Nairātmya and Karman (the life-long problem of Louis de La Vallée Poussin's thought) by Maryla Falk.

Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society Vol. XXVI, part III.

- The name "Chota Nagpur" by Mangobinda Banerji.—Author also discusses other place-names of Chota Nagpur, e.g. "Palamau," "Hazaribagh," "Singbhum," "Manbhum."
- Tibetan Titbits by S. C. Sarkar. Comments on Tilopā and Nāropā.
- Ninety-three inscriptions on the Kurkihar Bronzes.—Short inscriptions of the Pāla-age in Sanskrit.

Journal of Indian History Vol. XIX, part 2.

Origin of Slavery in Indo-Aryan Economy by Atindra Nath Bose.—Not a very careful treatment of the subject.

Some Observations on the Character and Achievements of Candragupta II Vikramāditya by Jagan Nath.

The Vanci Problem by T. K. Krishna Menon.—Discussion as to the location of the original Cera capital—was it on the eastern side of the Western Ghats or on the western side?

Nanak Panthis or The Sikh and Sikhism of the 17th Century (translated from Muhsin Fani's *Dabistan-i-Mazāhib*) by Ganda Singh.

The Fall of Vijayanagar and the Nationalization of Muslim Art in the Dakhan by H. Goetz.—Though defeated and destroyed, yet Vijayanagar influenced the art of the conquerors.

Journal of the Malayan Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society Vol. XVIII. Part I. February 1940.

Archæological Researches on Ancient Indian Colonization in Malaya by H. G. Quaritch Wales.—Contains important historical conclusions based on the archæological discoveries.

New Indian Antiquary, Vol. III, nos. 5-7.

Non-R̥gvedic Mantras Rubricated in the Āśvalāyana-Gṛhya-Sūtra by V. M. Apte. Elaborate text-critical and exegetical notes.

Sur Les Infinitifs Védiques en -ase by Louis Renou.—Detailed examination of the infinitives in -ase in the Veda.

INDIAN CULTURE

Vol. VII.

APRIL—JUNE, 1941.

No. 4.

CONTENTS

ARTICLES

Page

THE MEANING OF *SUYA* AMONG THE JAINAS.

By DR. AMULYACHANDRA SEN, M.A., D.PHIL. 391

REFERENCES TO INDIAN HISTORICAL AND QUASI-HISTORICAL RECORDS IN HIUEN-TSANG.

By DR. U. N. GHOSHA, M.A., PH.D. 397

PAIKPĀRĀ VĀSUDEVA IMAGE INSCRIPTION OF KING GOVINDACANDRA OF BENGAL—REGNAL YEAR 23.

By DR. DINES CHANDRA SIRCAR, M.A., PH.D. 405

SOME CURE DEITIES.

By MR. NANIMADHAB CHAUDHURI, M.A. 417

AN IMPORTANT ASPECT OF PATAÑJALIAN TECHNIQUE OF INTERPRETATION.

By MR. K. MADHAVA KRISHNA SARMA, M.O.L. 433

LOLIMBARĀJA AND HIS WORKS.

By MR. P. K. GODE, M.A. 447

KAṆIṢKA'S ERA.

By PROF. PRABODH CHANDRA SENCUPTA, M.A. 457

LATIN AND SANSKRIT.

By DR. BATAKRISHNA GHOSH, D.PHIL. (Munich), D.LIT. (Paris). .. 463

MISCELLANEA

AN UNNOTICED REFERENCE TO VIJAYANAGARA.

By DR. B. A. SALETORÉ, M.A., PH.D., D.PHIL. 483

ON SOME WORDS IN THE INSCRIPTIONS OF AŚOKA.

By DR. DINES CHANDRA SIRCAR, M.A., PH.D. 487

SOME DATES OF THE KUṢĀṆA KHAROṢṬHĪ RECORDS AND
THEIR BEARING ON THE INITIAL YEAR OF THE KUṢĀṆA
ERA.

By MR. BAIJ NATH PURI, M.A. 490

FURTHER EVIDENCE ON GODDESS NANA AS MOTHER GOD-
DES AMBĀ.

By MR. BAIJ NATH PURI, M.A. 492

REVIEW

THE ARCHAEOLOGY OF GUJARAT.

By DR. D. R. BHANDARKAR, M.A., PH.D., F.R.A.S.B. 495

ĀCĀRYA-PUṢPĀṆJALĪ VOLUME.

By MR. BAIJ NATH PURI, M.A. 496

OLD PERSIAN INSCRIPTIONS.

By DR. BATAKRISHNA GHOSH, D.PHIL. (Munich), D.LIT. (Paris). . . . 498

WOMEN IN ṚGVEDA.

By DR. BATAKRISHNA GHOSH, D.PHIL. (Munich), D.LIT. (Paris). . . . 499

VON DER SEELE DER INDISCHEN FRAU.

By DR. BATAKRISHNA GHOSH, D.PHIL. (Munich), D.LIT. (Paris). . . . 500

INSCRIPTIONS DU CAMBODGE.

By DR. BATAKRISHNA GHOSH, D.PHIL. (Munich), D.LIT. (Paris). . . . 501

IMPORTANT CONTRIBUTIONS TO ORIENTAL JOURNALS. 503-512

LAGHUMANASAM.

Edited and Translated by MR. N. K. MAJUMDER, M.A. 73-80

JUST OUT!

JUST OUT!

THE INDIAN RESEARCH INSTITUTE

Tutorial Series no. I.

Principles of Politics

By

R. C. ADHIKARY.

Indispensable for Students of Politics and persons interested in
the subject of Political Science.

(Pages 660+xxiv)

Price Rs. 8/-

To be had of the INDIAN RESEARCH INSTITUTE,
170, Maniktala Street, Calcutta.

OBITUARY NOTICE

The Editors of "Indian Culture" and the Secretary, The Indian Research Institute, mourn with Dr. B. C. Law, a Vice-President and Patron of the Indian Research Institute, and formerly an editor and now Chairman of the Advisory Committee of this Journal, the death, in the flower of youth, of Master Gopal Chunder Law, his only son.

May his soul rest in eternal peace and may the Almighty give Dr. Law strength and fortitude to bear this severe trial !

Words cannot tell, nor tears express, the sorrow we feel. Dreadfully true are indeed the words of the Vedic R̥ṣi :—

न देवानामति व्रतं शतात्मा च न जीवति ।

R̥gveda X. 33. 9.

THE MEANING OF *SUYA* AMONG THE JAINAS

By AMULYACHANDRA SEN

As enunciated by Umāsvāti, the well-known authority on Jaina dogmatics, the way to Mokṣa consists in right belief, right knowledge and right conduct,¹ which shows how important the acquisition of knowledge was to the Jainas. As is usual with them in all matters that engaged their attention, the Jainas analysed *nāṇa* 'knowledge' into all its possible varieties and sub-divisions, viz., first into two broad classes of *ṣaccakkha* and *parokkha*,² and then the first into *ohi*, *maṇapajjava* and *kevala*, and the second into *mai* and *suya*.³ *Ṣaccakkha* in its three varieties relates to occult or superhuman knowledge which we shall leave aside here as they are irrelevant for our present purposes.⁴

Of *parokkha*, the two varieties are thus described :—

(i) *Mai* (*mati*) — it is the general name of all knowledge acquired by the sense-organs with the co-operation of the mind.⁵ While Umāsvāti and other later authors use the term *mati*, the Canon knows this form of knowledge by the name of *ābhinibohiya*. Apparently on the basis of this, Umāsvāti mentions *abhinibodha* as one of the synonyms of *mati*,⁶ and *Nandī* p. 140 A, in a passage just to be quoted, uses both the terms *ābhinibohiya* and *mai* synonymously. *Mai* knowledge has been sub-divided into many varieties which however are not of much interest to us in our present enquiry. But one small point has to be noticed in this connection, viz. the relation between *Mai* and *Suya* (the other variety of *parokkha* knowledge). According to *Nandī* p. 140 A, *Mai* and *Suya* are inseparable and always go hand in hand—*jaṭṭha ābhinibohiya nāṇaṃ tattha suya-nāṇaṃ, jaṭṭha suya-nāṇaṃ tattha ābhinibohiya-nāṇaṃ, do 'vi eyāim aṇṇa-m-aṇṇa-m-anugayāim*. But in spite of the intimate relation of concomitance thus established between *Mai* and *Suya*, *Nandī*, *loc. cit.*, makes a difference between

1. Tattvārthādhigama-sūtra, I. i.

2. *Nandī*, p. 71 B; Tat-s. I. 11-12. 3. *Nandī*, p. 65 A; Tat-s. I. 9.

4. The Jainas, too, when speaking of the study of the sacred scriptures, say "The (other) four kinds of knowledge are to be set aside," *Anuyogodvāra*, i.

5. *Nandī*, p. 143 ff., Tat-s. I. 13-19; Schubring, *Die Lehre der Jainas*, p. 102.

6. Tat-s. I. 13.

the two, on the authority of ancient teachers, in these words—*mai-puvvam jēṇa suyam, na mai suya-puvviyā*, 'Suya presupposes (or is preceded by) *mai* but *mai* does not presuppose (or is not preceded by) *Suya*.' *Umāsvāti* also means the same thing when he describes *śruta* as *matī-pūrvam* (Tat-s. I. 20). The difference thus made between these two varieties of indirect (*parokkha*) knowledge seems to be meant to emphasise the fact that *Suya* or scriptural knowledge is not possible to one whose sense-organs and mind are not in proper working order.

(ii) *Suya* is divided into fourteen kinds which really comprise of seven kinds, each kind being again divided into its positive and negative aspect. *Nandī* p. 187 A ff. goes elaborately into analysing these fourteen divisions as well as their numerous sub-divisions. The mode of treatment adopted in these analyses is the stand-point of the schoolman who looks at a thing from various angles and aspects. The divisions are thus often overlapping. There is much of interest here to a psychologist engaged in studying the processes of acquisition of indirect knowledge, but for our present purposes we may leave them aside, except such items among them which we shall presently notice. One fact however becomes plain from all these scholastic divisions, viz. that acquisition of knowledge indirectly (*parokkha*) came to mean to the Jainas acquisition of second-hand knowledge, that second-hand knowledge was held to be identical with knowledge reduced to writing, which soon came to mean the sacred scriptures. To sum it up briefly, to the Jainas *Suya* is nothing but knowledge of their canonical texts, just as *Śruti* among the Brahmanical community denoted the knowledge of the Vedic lore. In this sense therefore *Suya* is synonymous with the *āgama*, i.e. the scriptures handed down from antiquity, and we can well understand the eulogisation of members of the order, therefore, who are *bahu-ssuya* and *bahu-āgama*,⁷ 'well-versed in the knowledge of the sacred scriptures.'

We shall now notice some interesting information yielded by the different ways in which *suya* has been sub-divided. In the third of the seven kinds of division, *Suya* is classed into *samma* (true scriptural knowledge, viz. that of the twelve *aṅga* texts) and *miccha*, false scriptures. Under *miccha* come the teachings of all other non-Jaina systems and sects, such as Mahābhārata, Rāmāyaṇa, Bhimāsauruk-

7. *Vavahāra* 1. 34. It is interesting to note in this connection that in Girnar Rock Edict XII, Aśoka uses the words *bahu-śruta* and *āgama* in the same sentence—*evam hi Devānaṃpiyasa ichā kinti sava-pāsaṇḍā bahu-śrutā ca asu, kalāṇ'-āgamā ca asu*, Hultzsch, *Inscrip. of Aśoka*, new ed., 1925, p. 21.

kha (?), Koḍillaya (the Arthaśāstra of Kauṭilya), Sagadabhaddia (?), Ghoḍagamuha (probably the *Kāmasāstras* are meant, one of this school being called Ghotakamukha), Kappāsiya (Kāśyapiya ?),⁸ Nāgasuhuma (?), Kaṇagasattarī (?), Vaisesia (Vaiśeṣika), Buddha-vayaṇa, Terasia (a schismatic school among the Jainas),⁹ Kāvīlī¹⁰ (followers of Kapila), Logāyaya¹¹ (the Lokāyatas), Saṭṭhi-tanta (Sāṃkhya), Mād-hara (?), Purāṇa, Vāgarāṇa (Vyākaraṇa), Bhāgavaya (the Bhāgavatas), Pāyaṇjali (Yoga), Pussadevaya (?), Leha, gaṇiya...saṇa-rua,¹² nāḍaga (Nāṭyaśāstra), and the four Vedas along with their *aṅgas* and *upāṅgas*. This list throws light on contemporary conditions, although the sects, whose identification is doubtful still remain obscure.¹³

Another of the seven divisions of *Suya*, the sixth, is also deserving of attention. In this, *Suya* has been divided into *gamiya* (regarded as being the same as *diṭṭhivāya*) and *agamiya* (regarded as being the same as *Kāliya-sutta*), or, both of these jointly have been classified into *aṅga-paviṭṭha* and *aṅga-bāhira*.¹⁴ *Aṅga-paviṭṭha*, whereby are meant the twelve *aṅga*-texts, viz. Āyāra, Sūyagaḍa, etc., needs no further explanation, but *aṅga-bāhira* has to be gone into fully.

Aṅga-bāhira has been divided into two classes, *Āvassaya* and *Āvassaya-vairitta*, thus—

(i) *Āvassaya*¹⁵—it has six forms, viz.,

(a) *Sāmāiya*—this is a short formula¹⁶ to be repeated many

8. Followers of Purāṇa Kassapa, see Barua, *Hist. of Pre-Buddh. Ind. Phil.*, 278.

9. See Sen, Amulyachandra, *Schools and Sects in Jaina Literature*, pp. 7, 44.

10. By 'doctrine of Kapila,' Abhayadeva, the commentator, understands the doctrine of Sāṃkhya, see *ibid.*, p. 14.

11. or the Nāstikas.

12. These are the well-known "seventy-two (mundane) arts (kalāo)" of Jaina literature, beginning with writing, reckoning etc. and ending with the knowledge of birds' cries.

13. See Winternitz, *Hist. of Ind. Lit.*, II, p. 473.

14. See Schubring, *Lehre*, p. 55 ff. for a full discussion on this scholastic mode of classifying the Canon.

15. Leumann, *Uebersicht über die Āvaśyaka-Literatur*, Hamburg 1935, has reviewed the entire complex of the Āvaśyaka literature; see also Schubring, *Lehre*, p. 170. The formulas named below are found in several publications of recent date by the Jainas dealing with their religious formulas, such as Pañca-Pratikramaṇa-Sūtra (PPS.), Jaina Atmānanda-sabhā, Bhavanagar.

16. See Leumann, *Uebersicht*, p. 6^a; PPS., p. 22.

times during the day, expressing the vow of avoiding sin in thought, word or deed, committing it oneself, or making another commit it or approving of another's committing it.

(b) *Cauviṣa-tthava*—a hymn of prayer in seven stanzas to the twenty-four Tīrthaṃkaras; this *stava* is also commonly known as “ujjoyagara.”¹⁷

(c) *Vandana*—respectful salutation of one's superiors by touching his feet with one's hands and begging for forgiveness of faults committed during the day or night.¹⁸

(d) *Paḍikkamaṇa*—formulas of confession of sin.¹⁹

(e) *Kāussassa*—a motionless standing posture, with the arms hanging down, in an attitude of devotion, accompanied by suspension of breath, coughing etc., for the duration of time required in one inhalation of breath.²⁰

(f) *Paccakkhāṇa*—formulas for the renunciation of particular kinds of food and drink.²¹

(ii) *Āvassaya-vairitta*—is of two kinds, viz.,

(a) *Kāliya*—it is the name of certain texts, such as *Uttarajjhayaṇa*, etc., and

(b) *Ukkāliya*—it is the name of certain other texts, such as *Dasaveyāliya* etc.

The sacred texts are divided into these two classes according as they are to be studied during or outside of the prescribed periods of study for Jaina ascetics,²² viz. the first and last of the four *pauruṣis* into which day and night are divided, as Malayagiri, quoting the *Cuṇṇi*, says “*yaṭ divasa-niṣā-prathama-pāścima-pauruṣi-dvaya eva paṭhyate tat kālīkaṃ yaṭ punaḥ kāla-velā-varjjaṃ paṭhyate tad utkālīkaṃ.*”²³ There seems to be no logical reason, thinks Schubring,²⁴ for dividing the sacred texts into these categories, for, *Dasaveyāliya* (an *ukkāliya* text) for instance, is no less important than *Uttarajjhayaṇa*, a *kāliya* text; it was none-the-less a well-recognised mode of classifying the scriptures.

It will be evident from the treatment of *Sūya* in *Nandī* as quoted above, that *Sūya* almost exclusively meant the sacred scriptures, the

17. Leumann, *Uebersicht*, p. 6 b; PPS., p. 17.

18. Leumann, *Uebersicht*, p. 7 b; PPS., p. 72.

19. PPS., pp. 10, 62.

20. See Schubring, *Lehre*, p. 178.

21. PPS., p. 237 ff.

22. *Uttarajjh.* XXVI.

23. *Nandivṛtti*, p. 204 A; Leumann, *Uebersicht*, p. 21 b, n. 1-2.

24. *Lehre*, p. 56.

study and knowledge of which were one of the most important duties of a Jaina ascetic. But in course of time when the church fell into evil days and there were schisms and disorder among the community, there arose a class of ascetics who disregarded authority and decided their own ways, even in respect of the study of the scriptures; they were self-initiated and self-constituted members of the church, having no accredited teacher and belonging to no *gaṇa*, *sāhā* or *kula*. The fierce recrimination used against these new-fangled members by the orthodox community, as also the disorder in the church owing to the rivalry between the two opposing groups, have been described at length by the *Āṅgacūliyā*,²⁵ which obviously portrayed contemporary conditions in the church. As a result of these disorders, it came to be strictly insisted upon that the handing down of the sacred scriptures was to be effected in a prescribed manner, viz. that only a properly ordained teacher was entitled to instruct on scriptural matters, and that this instruction can be received by none except those who have been properly and formally initiated into the Order.²⁶ Thus was to be maintained the unbroken and unimpaired character of *paramparā* in the handing down of the scriptures, which is to be traced back to Mahāvīra himself. Just as Mahāvīra initiated and instructed Indabhūi and others, just as Suhamma initiated and instructed Jambu, so in like manner must all monks and nuns receive proper initiation from the hands of a properly ordained *āyariya* before they can take up the study of the scriptures, and, at the time of the initiation the new ascetic must know with exactness to what *gaṇa*, *kula* or *sāhā*²⁷ he belongs and through what line of spiritual succession his teacher claims direct descent from Suhamma himself. The factor of *guru-paramparā* was therefore of supreme and essential necessity and thus *Suya* in its exact sense means to the Jainas the knowledge of the scriptures as handed down through a properly qualified teacher.

25. MS. orient. fol. no. 2565 in Berlin State Library, p. 3 B ff.

26. *Āṅgacūliyā*, p. 3 A f.

27. See Schubring, *Lehre*, pp. 34, 160, 162 for the explanation of these technical terms in the organisation of the Order.

REFERENCES TO INDIAN HISTORICAL AND QUASI-HISTORICAL RECORDS IN HIUEN-TSANG.

By U. N. GHOSHAL

In the course of his narrative of his great work of travels in India, Hiuen Tsang from time to time records legends of the foundation of cities such as Campā (Watters, *On Yuan Chwang*, II, p. 181), Pāṭaliputra (Ibid, II, p. 87), Kanyākubja (Ibid, I, p. 341) and the like. These stories have nothing Buddhistic about them and are very like similar tales known to epic and Purāṇic traditions. The stories refer themselves as a rule to a very distant past, when men lived, so we are told, for countless years. The story of Pāṭaliputra connects itself, with the primitive belief in Dryads or tree-spirits, that of Campā refers to a primitive goddess descended from heaven, while the story of Kanyākubja referring to the curse of "the Great Tree-Rṣi" (itself a significant reminder of the amalgam of primitive and Brāhmanical beliefs) has almost its exact parallel in a Brāhmanical legend attributing the origin of the city to the curse of the Rṣi Vāyu (Watters, *loc. cit.*). Equally Brahmanical is the story of the foundation of Puruṣapura in Paramārtha's *Life of Vasubandhu*, where it is said that the city was so called because it was there that the God Viṣṇu showed himself as a hero (Puruṣa) by killing a demon. (See Takakusu's translation of the Chinese version of this work in *T'oung Pao*, 1904). It follows from the above that the traditions of city-foundations recorded by Hiuen Tsang have a pre-Buddhistic, and in some cases a pre-Aryan, origin.

Hiuen Tsang in the course of his work frequently refers to what may be called topographical traditions relating to the countless sites that he visited. He thus mentions numberless *stūpas* with or without relics, extending from Kapiśā and the Sindhu country in the west to Puṇḍravardhana and Samatāṭa in the east and from Kashmir and Nepal in the north to the Cola country in the south, which are all attributed to Asoka. Sundry monasteries as well as images and other sacred objects in the localities that he visited are likewise attributed to Asoka and other founders (cf. his notices of the sandal-wood image of Buddha at Kauśāmbī made for king Udayana, I, p. 368; of the site of Prasenajit's Chapel and Mahāprajāpati's nunnery at Śrāvastī, I, p. 377; of the Buddha image on the Jetavana site made for king Prasenajit, I, p. 384). Often the pilgrim mentions the miracles

attending the sacred objects, the modes of their worship and so forth, which bring his account very close to that of modern *māhātmyas* of sacred places. In some cases the traditions are of a purely secular character. (Cf. the pilgrim's notices of Bimbisāra's road and causeway at Rājagṛha, I, pp. 146 ff.; of the sites of Prasenajit's palace and Sudatta's house at Śrāvastī, I, p. 376). One instance is interesting as pointing to a tradition of local origin quite unknown to the general body of Buddhist traditions. There the pilgrim mentions (I, p. 236) a tope erected by Uttarāsena, king of Udyāna to enclose his share of Buddha's relics,—a story which is altogether unknown to the Buddhist texts describing Buddha's Parinirvāṇa (cf. Watters' remarks, *loc. cit.*). Another instance cited by Hiuen Tsang is very interesting as illustrating a conflict of traditions. Speaking of five ruined topes in the vicinity of Pāṭaliputra, the pilgrim observes (II, p. 96) that according to "Indian records" these were built by Aśoka to enshrine the five pints of relics left over after building eighty-four thousand topes, while according to the "unauthorised statements" of "disciples of little faith," they represented "the five treasures of King Nanda's seven precious substances." As Watters points out in this connection, these five topes are unknown to Fa Hien and they do not agree with the legend of Aśoka's building eighty-four thousand topes told by Hiuen Tsang himself. The latter version, we may point out, receives some support from references in an old Tamil historical poem and the Sinhalese *Mahāvamsa* which mention Nanda's accumulated treasures being concealed in the bed of the Ganges (for references see Raychaudhuri, *Political History of Ancient India*, 4th ed., pp. 190-191). Here, then, we have a concrete instance of the way in which the Buddhists were increasing the stock of Aśokan traditions at the expense of earlier ones.

The traditions recorded by the pilgrim about Kaniṣka and Aśoka though likewise centering around specific localities, bear a more general character because of the importance of their subjects. Speaking of Kaniṣka's *stūpa* at Puruṣapura (I, pp. 203-204), the pilgrim tells us how Buddha himself predicted the building of the *stūpa* by Kaniṣka four hundred years after his decease, how the unbelieving "sovereign of all Jambudvīpa" was converted to Buddhism, how trusting to his own merits, he built the great *stūpa*, and how his pride was humbled in the long run. The pilgrim also mentions other traditions and legends about Kaniṣka such as his reception of the princely hostages who were accommodated in three monasteries in India, Gāndhāra and Kapiśā (I, p. 124), his conversion of the dragon king in the vicinity of Kapiśā (I, pp. 127-128) and his summoning of the Council (I, pp. 270-271). How untrustworthy the chronology of his

Indian sources had become already in Hiuen Tsang's time may be demonstrated from the fact that in another context (I, p. 222), Kaniṣka is said to have lived five hundred years after Buddha's decease.

Far more copious than the tales connected with Kaniṣka are those related by the pilgrim with regard to the great king Aśoka. Speaking of the Kunāla *stūpa* at Taxila, Hiuen Tsang tells us (I, 246) how Aśoka at the instance of his wicked queen Tīṣyarakṣitā sent his gentle and pious son to govern Takṣaśilā, how the prince was blinded there through the wicked machinations of the queen, how the blind prince and his wife returned to Pāṭaliputra and how his eyesight was at last restored through the intervention of a Buddhist saint. Again, in course of his description of Pāṭaliputra, the pilgrim tells (II, p. 88) the whole story of Aśoka's celebrated Hell-prison. In the same context, he gives in full (II, p. 91) the story of the building of eighty-four thousand relic *stūpas* by Aśoka after his conversion at the hands of the sage Upagupta (Among the few references to Aśokan inscriptions in Hiuen Tsang may be mentioned his description of a stone pillar within the precincts of Pāṭaliputra, II, p. 93. This bore "a much injured" inscription of which the sum and substance was that Aśoka had thrice given Jambudvīpa as a religious offering to the Buddhist order and thrice redeemed it with his own precious substances. The expression seems to suggest that the purport of the inscription was conveyed to the pilgrim by unscrupulous *bhikṣus* who took advantage of their visitor's ignorance of its script).

Brief and imperfect as are the Aśokan traditions mentioned by Hiuen Tsang, we may safely trace them to the ancient famous work known as *Aśokāvadāna* which formed one of the sources of the *Divyāvadāna* and which now exists in two distinct Chinese versions that may be rendered as *Aśokarājāvadāna* and *Aśokarājasūtra* (On this important work and its versions see J. Przyluski, *Le Légende de l'Empereur Asoka, Avant-propos*, xi-xiii. According to this author the original *Aśokāvadāna* was probably composed by a monk of Mathurā a century before Kaniṣka's time). Indeed the account of Aśoka's exploits given by the pilgrim agree with but slight differences with those of the *Divyāvadāna* and the two Chinese versions above-mentioned (See Watters' comparison of these accounts, *loc. cit.*). Hiuen Tsang's observations may be taken to indicate that the Aśokan traditions had already become much confused in his time. Thus he speaks (II, p. 88) of king Aśoka, "great-grandson of king Bimbisāra," who in 100 A.B. transferred his capital from Rājagṛha to Pāṭaliputra. Again he speaks (I, p. 267) of Aśoka, king of Magadha, who in 100 A.B. built five hundred monasteries for the benefit of as many Arhats

settled in Kashmir and gave up the whole country to the Buddhist church. Evidently the author confused the great king Aśoka with his namesake Kālāśoka of the Sinhalese chronicles (Kākavarṇa of the Purāṇas) who succeeded his father Śiśunāga on the throne of Magadha. According to the Purāṇas Bimbisāra was fourth in succession from Kākavarṇa who was the son of Śiśunāga, while in the version of the Sinhalese chronicles Kākavarṇa was the son of Susunāga who supplanted the dynasty of Bimbisāra. Hiuen Tsang's statement introduces us to a third version of early Magadhan genealogies. This preserves the Purāṇic interval of three generations between Kākavarṇa and Bimbisāra but reverses the order of descent. Its chronology of 100 A.B. again is quite different from that of the Purāṇas and Sinhalese chronicles.

The story of Aśoka forms, as it were, the transition to another class of compositions utilised by the pilgrim in his description of India. This corresponds to what may be called the Lives or Legends of the great Founder of the Faith in his past and present lives as well as those of the four past Buddhas, and of the future Buddha, the tales of such Masters as Aśvaghōṣa, Nāgārjuna, Deva, Kumāralabdha, Pārśva, Manoratha, Asaṅga, Vasubandhu, Śīlabhadra, Diṇnāga, Bhāviveka, Guṇaprabha, Saṅghabhadra, Vimalamitra, Guṇamati and Sthiramati. (For references see Watter's Index s.v.). These stories are traceable in sundry Buddhist texts, sometimes with such slight differences as indicate varying versions.

In the course of his narrative, Hiuen Tsang refers to some of the great events in the Buddhist church-history. Such, e.g. is his account of the Council of Rājagṛha (II, pp. 159-160) which refers to the preparation of two sets of canon, viz., "the President's Collection" (*Sthavīranikāya*) at the Council of Mahākāśyapa and "the Great Congregation's Collection" (*Mahāsaṅghikanikāya*) at the Council of the mixed majority of Bhikṣus. Such again is Hiuen Tsang's description of the Second Council (II, 75) which was held at Vaiśālī. Fuller accounts of the first two Councils are found in the Vinaya treatises of almost all the principal Buddhist sects such as the Theravādins, the Mahīśāsakas, the Dharmaguptas, the Haimavatas, the Mahāsaṅghikas, and the Mūlasarvāstivādins of which the last five are preserved in Chinese versions and the Mūlasarvāstivādin is preserved also in the Tibetan version. A short account of the Council of Kaniṣka occurs in the Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya. (For a comprehensive survey of Vinaya, Sūtra and allied texts bearing on the Council of Rājagṛha, see Przyluski, *La Concile de Rājagṛha*; for the Council of Kaniṣka, see Huber, *BEFEO*, t. 14, translating the story in Bhaiṣajyavastu section of the Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinaya). A general comparison of

Hiuen Tsang's accounts with those of the canonical texts seems to prove that he followed imperfect and somewhat faulty versions of the first two Councils, while his notice of Kaniška's Council is probably the fullest that has come down to us (see Watters' comparisons, *loc. cit.*).

Another class of authorities utilised by Hiuen Tsang may be mentioned under the head 'Records of Monasteries'. The fullest account that he gives in this connection is about the famous Monastery of Nālandā (Watters II, pp. 164-165. Cf. *Life* p. 110). In the course of his description Hiuen Tsang, after giving two conflicting traditions about the origin of the name, mentions how the original establishment consisting of a mango-grove was purchased for Buddha by five hundred merchants. "Soon after Buddha's decease" king Śakrāditya built a monastery which was followed by the building of five other monasteries by as many kings *viz.*, Buddhagupta, Tathāgatagupta, Bālāditya, Vajra and an unnamed king of mid-India. How confused the chronology is may be gauged from the fact that while the *Records* mention Śakrāditya as having lived soon after Buddha's decease, the *Life* refers to seven-hundred years as intervening between the foundation of the monastery and Hiuen Tsang's time. The Pāli canonical tradition again, while representing the Buddha as visiting the place on several occasions, is silent about purchase of the mango-grove for him by 500 merchants. (For references to Nālandā in the Pāli canon, see Hirananda Sastri, *Nalanda in Ancient Literature, Proceedings of the All-India Fifth Oriental Conference*, Vol. I. pp. 386-400. Of the five named kings of Hiuen Tsang the first two have recently been identified on plausible grounds with as many known kings of the Gupta dynasty, *viz.*, Kumāragupta I and Buddhagupta, who ruled in the second half of the fifth century A.D. Cf. Raychaudhuri, *op. cit.* p. 501). In the case of many other monasteries, Hiuen Tsang is careful to record the names of the great scholars who lived there and wrote their works.

Quite different from the above is the branch of official annals in charge of appropriate officers, of which a tantalisingly brief account is given by Hiuen Tsang, in connection with his general description of India. He says (Watters, I, p. 154) : "As to their archives and records there are separate custodians of these. The official annals and state-papers are called collectively *ni-lo-pi-t's* (or *ch'a*); in these good and bad are recorded and instances of public calamity and good fortune are set forth in detail". It is not possible to connect these interesting annals (of which the Sanskrit original has been restored as *Nīlapīṭa*) with the functions either of the Akṣapaṭalika of the Arthaśāstra or the Pustapāla of Sanskrit epigraphs. For the former was more or less

in charge of legal or financial documents, while the latter was entrusted with keeping records of boundaries of fields and so forth. Whatever that may be, Hiuen Tsang seems to give several concrete instances of such annals in the course of his work. Thus, while mentioning an anecdote of "Vikramāditya King of Śrāvastī" (I, pp. 211-212), he tells us that the 'State Annalist' had made a record of the fact that Manoratha the Buddhist Master had once paid a barber the same sum which the king gave to a peasant, viz. a lack of gold coins; this so much wounded the king's pride that he called together an assembly of one hundred learned non-Buddhists to meet Manoratha in discussion. Again while describing the country of Mo-la-po (Mālava?) Hiuen Tsang (II, p. 242) quotes the local records as mentioning a good and able king called Śīlāditya who reigned over the country sixty years before the pilgrim's arrival.

Dynastic history properly so called is occasionally referred to in Hiuen Tsang's work. Of Nepal he says (II, p. 84) that the kings were Kṣatriya Licchavīs and were "eminent scholars and believing Buddhists". "A recent king" whose name is given as Amśuvarman, had, we are told, composed a treatise on etymology. This account is in general agreement with what history tells us about a long line of Licchavi (otherwise called Sūryavamśī) kings of Nepal, who reigned from the 1st century to the middle of the 8th century A.D. (See R. G. Basak, *History of North-Eastern India*, pp. 283-285 for the latest account of this dynasty). Of one of these kings, Vṛṣadeva, the Vamśāvalī says that he "built monasteries and installed images of Lokēśvara and other Buddhist divinities" (Ibid, p. 286). In other respects however, Hiuen Tsang's account seems to be imperfect, if not faulty. Thus, most of the Licchavi kings are known from their inscriptions to have been followers of the Brahmanical religion. Again Amśuvarman, who, by the way, belonged to a different dynasty (the Thākuri) was not "a recent king" in Hiuen Tsang's time. For his records can be traced certainly to 646 A.D. and probably also to 651-652 A.D. (See Basak, *op. cit.*, pp. 293-295). The pilgrim's faulty rendering of the dynastic history is probably due to the fact that he did not personally visit the country. Speaking of the country of Kāmarūpa, Hiuen Tsang says (II, p. 186), that the reigning king called Bhāskaravarman (or Kumāra) was a Brāhmaṇa by caste and 'a descendant of Nārāyaṇa Deva', while the sovereignty was transmitted in his family for one thousand generations. This statement agrees on the whole with the contemporary Nidhanpur grant of Bhāskaravarman, which, after tracing the line of kings to Viṣṇu's son Naraka, places an interval of nearly three thousand years after Naraka's second successor during which Kāmarūpa was ruled by many kings of the same race. Here again, as in

the case of Nepal, the pilgrim must have borrowed his account from existing dynastic records. Most copious of the pilgrim's references to dynastic histories are those relating to Kashmir. Of this kingdom he gives a long connected account (I, pp. 265-279) which may be arranged in the following chronological order :

- 50 A.B.—Reclamation of Kashmir by Madhyāntika, disciple of Ānanda, in accordance with Buddha's prophecy.
- Soon after Madhyāntika's decease—Foreign slaves became rulers of the country and were contemptuously called *Kṛīta* (or 'the Bought').
- 100 A.B.—Settlement of 500 Arhats from India followed by gift of the whole country to the Buddhist church by Aśoka, 'king of Magadha'.
- 400 A.B.—Meeting of Kaṇiṣka's Council and his renewal of Aśoka's gift of the whole country to the Buddhist church.
- 600 A.B.—Invasion of Kashmir by a zealous Buddhist king of the Tokhara country, who killed the Kṛitīya tyrant and restored Buddhism to the country.
- In course of time Kṛitīyas regained sovereignty and Kashmir gave itself to other sects.

To the above we may add what Hiuen Tsang says in another context (I, pp. 288-289) about Mihirakūla, king of the Indians, who after his defeat by Bālāditya, king of Magadha, treacherously seized the throne of Kashmir and caused the demolition of 1600 topes and monasteries and put to death nine *koṭis* of lay adherents of Buddhism. He reigned some centuries before Hiuen Tsang's time.

Some of these traditions have more or less exact parallels in extant Buddhist texts and are no doubt derived from similar sources (Cf. the parallels which Watters, loc. cit., draws between Hiuen Tsang's account of Madhyāntika's reclamation of the settlement of 500 Arhats and of the Council of Kaṇiṣka with corresponding narratives in the *Aśokāvadāna*, in Sarvāstivādin Vinaya, in Paramārtha's *Life of Vasubandhu* and in Tāranātha's *History of Buddhism*). Other traditions are of the same type as those appearing in the first three books of Kalhaṇa's *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* (Cf., e. g., Madhyāntika's story with what Kalhaṇa tells us about Prajāpati Kaśyapa who caused the gods to descend for killing a demon dwelling in the lake and who created the land known as Kashmir through that process (*Rājatarāṅgiṇī*, I, 26-27). In Kalhaṇa, (I, 102-3) as in Hiuen Tsang, Aśoka figures as a great king who embraced the doctrine of Jina and built numerous *stūpas* in Kashmir.

Even the confused statements of the pilgrim about the varying fortunes of Buddhism is paralleled by Kalhaṇa's account of the prosperous times of Buddhism under Abhimanyu I, followed by the destruction of the Buddhists and restoration of the traditional cult through favour of the Nāgas in subsequent times (I, 177-185). As regards Mihirakula, Kalhaṇa, like the Chinese pilgrim, dwells on the king's horrible cruelties calling him the 'destroyer of three crores of human beings'. The pilgrim's fantastic chronology of the king's reign is even outdone by Kalhaṇa who would assign him to the period 704-634 B.C. (For this see Stein, *Rājatarāṅgiṇī* tr. Introduction, p. 65). It would thus seem that Hiuen Tsang drew his materials from the type of compositions which formed the principal source of Kalhaṇa's *Rājatarāṅgiṇī*, viz., the chronicles and lists of kings.

Besides the above, Hiuen Tsang mentions some fragments of what may be called contemporary history based chiefly on personal observation and enquiries. This is the case with his account of Śaśāṅka, 'the recent king' of Karnaśuvarṇa (I, p. 343, II, 92, 115-116 etc.) who is stigmatised as a great persecutor of Buddhism and as the treacherous murderer of Rājyavardhana; of Bhāskaravarman, king of Kāmarūpa (I, p. 348; II, p. 186 etc.) who welcomed the pilgrim to his capital; and lastly and above all, Harṣa (I, pp. 343-344, 349 etc.), who became the pilgrim's devoted disciple and entertained him at his royal assemblies of Kanyākubja and Prayāga.

To sum up. The historical and semi-historical records utilised by the pilgrim in his great work may be broadly classified under eight heads: (i) pre-Buddhistic tales of the foundations of cities, (ii) topographical traditions connected with kings of the past, (iii) the *Aśokāvadāna*, (iv) canonical and non-canonical works containing references to the lives or legends of the saints, Buddhist church-history and so forth, (v) records of monasteries, (vi) official annals, (vii) dynastic history as recorded in *Vaṃśāvalis*, royal chronicles and so forth, (viii) contemporary history based chiefly upon personal observation. In many of these cases the traditions had become mixed up with extraneous matter (Buddha's prophecies and so forth). What was worse still, they had become charged with confusion of names (Cf. the cases of Aśoka and Kālāśoka), and specially and above all, by confusion of chronology (cf. the cases of Aśoka, Kaṇiṣka and Mihirakula). The chronology is uniformly recorded, as might be expected, according to the Buddhist era.

PĀIKPĀRĀ VĀSUDEVA IMAGE INSCRIPTION
OF KING GOVINDACANDRA OF BENGAL.

— REGNAL YEAR 23.

By DINES CHANDRA SIRCAR

A few years ago, an image of Vāsudeva was discovered below the surface of the earth at a village called Pāikpārā in Vikrampur. The village is within the jurisdiction of the Taṅgigārī Police Station (Munshiganj Subdivision) of the Dacca District. Mr. Kiran Chandra Sen managed to secure the image for the Āṭṣāhī Palli-Kalyān-Āśram, and it still lies in the Āśram's office at Āṭṣāhī which is not far from Pāikpārā. Recently an inscription on the pedestal of the image drew the attention of Mr. Jogendra Nath Gupta, author of the *Vikram-purer Itihās* (in Bengali), who secured inked estampages and eye-copies of the record prepared by Mr. Manindra Bhushan Gupta. I edit the inscription from the estampages and eye-copies, which have been kindly supplied to me by Mr. J. N. Gupta.

The inscription contains only three and half lines of writing between the usual figures of upāsaka at the right and left ends of the pedestal. A small figure of Garuḍa in the centre and a line coming down from above have practically divided the lines of writing into three parts. The *akṣaras* are about $\frac{1}{2}'' \times \frac{1}{2}''$ in size, and are in a fairly good state of preservation. The alphabet is Proto-Bengali and resembles the characters used in East Indian inscriptions of about the eleventh and twelfth centuries A. D. Initial *u* occurs once, and medial *u* resembles a small triangle placed at the base of the consonant. The *has-anta t* resembles the modern Bengali form turned upside down. Medial *e* is almost fully developed. Of the more developed *akṣaras*, *r* is of the triangular shape, and the lower part of both *t* and *bh* is curved towards the left. Other *akṣaras* resemble the forms found in the Pāla and Sena inscriptions belonging to the eleventh and twelfth centuries A. D. Triangular *r* (along with the wedge-shaped *r*) is however found in the Irda grant¹ of Nayapāla assigned by scholars to the end of the tenth century. The Caṇḍimau image inscription² of Rāmapāla uses the *akṣaras t* and *bh* with the lower part curved towards the left, and

1. *Ep. Ind.*, XXII, p. 150.

2. *M.A.S.B.*, V, Plate XXX.

this tendency of the lower curve is noticeable in some Indian inscriptions of the 11th century. Developed *e* sign is found in the records of Śricandra. Considering all these facts and also that the differentiation of Bāhari and Bengali forms of *akṣaras* are complete in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries and that R. D. Banerji has satisfactorily demonstrated³ the simultaneous use in the Pāla period of both the older script of the records on copper and stone and the cursive script of common correspondence, it seems that the record under notice cannot be earlier than the middle of the eleventh century A. D. Of course the Bhāterā inscription of Govinda Keśavadeva⁴ assigned by scholars to 1049 A.D. uses a more developed script ; but it cannot be definitely assigned to the eleventh century and may be later. I am inclined to believe that the Pāikpārā inscription is written in the cursive script of the mid-eleventh century.

The language of the inscription is corrupt Sanskrit. But for the sixth *vibhakti* in °*candrasya* (line 1c) and the wrongly placed *visarga* in *sutaḥ* (line 2c), the record may have as well passed as one written in Bengali.

The inscription records that the image of Vāsudeva was caused to be made by a person called Gaṅgādāsa who has been described as *rālaṅjika* and as the son of *uparata* Pāradāsa. *Rālaṅjika* appears to indicate an inhabitant of a village like Ralaja. The word *uparata* shows that Pāradāsa was dead before the date of the construction of the image. This date is given as the twenty-third year of Śrīmad-Govindacandra, that is to say, the twenty-third regnal year of a king named Govindacandra. No inscription of this king has so far been published ; but king Govindacandra of Vaṅgāladeśa who came into conflict with the army of Rājendra Cola I a little before A. D. 1024⁵ is wellknown to all students of Indian history. Of late some records of kings belonging to the Candra dynasty to which Govindacandra belongs, have been discovered. From these we are now in a position to form an idea about the rule and the kingdom of some of the Candra kings. The present epigraph further supplies some valuable informations. Firstly, the Vikrampur region where the image is found very probably formed part of Govindacandra's kingdom.^{5a} Secondly, he ruled at

3. *Origin of the Bengali Script*, Calcutta, 1919, pp. 60, 68-69.

4. Bhandarkar, *List*, No. 1769.

5. *S.I.I.*, I, 1890, pp. 97, 99 ; *Ep. Ind.*, IX. p. 229 ff.

5a. The Candra kingdom included the Vikrampur region during the time of Śricandra. The suggestion that Govindacandra also ruled over the region

least for more than 22 years, that is to say, for an approximate period of 25 years. Thirdly, if we have to assign the record on palaeographic grounds to about the middle of the 11th century, Govindacandra's reign may roughly be ascribed to the period circa 1020-45 A.D.

In the inscription of Rājendra Cola, Govindacandra has been described as (the lord) of Vaṅgāladeśa, and this country has been clearly separated from Dakṣiṇa-Rāḍha, kingdom of Raṇaśūra, and from the kingdom of Mahīpāla which apparently included Uttara-Rāḍha.⁶ These indications together with the evidence of the inscriptions of the family to which Govindacandra belongs appear to show that Vaṅgāladeśa lay to the east of Rāḍha, that is to say, in south-eastern Bengal. As the ancient country of Vaṅga is also located in that part of Bengal, one has to determine whether Vaṅga and Vaṅgāla are identical. The name Vaṅgāla is found in records not earlier than the 11th century A.D. As regards the origin of the name, the author of the *Āin-i-Akbarī*⁷ says that the original name of Vaṅgāla was Vaṅga, that its former rulers raised mounds measuring ten yards in height and twenty in breadth throughout the country, which were called *āl*, and that from this suffix the name *Vaṅgāla* took its rise and currency. This 16th century identification of Vaṅga and Vaṅgāla has to be reconciled with the earlier evidence of inscriptions which mention Vaṅga and Vaṅgāla separately. Prof. H. C. Raychaudhuri⁸ has carefully examined all the evidences and has shown that the term Vaṅga was applied in ancient times in two senses. In a narrower sense Vaṅga signified the territory including the Vikrampur region and some parts of the country to the east of the Brahmaputra; in a wider sense however the term sometimes indicated the whole region from the east of the Brahmaputra upto the Kāsāi river (ancient Kapiśā) in the Midnapore District in the west. There can be no doubt that the Faridpur and Buckerganj Districts formed parts of Vaṅga. It is quite natural to suppose that the earth-mounds (*āl*) were constructed (as is the case

is further supported by the very recent discovery made by Dr. N. K. Bhattasali in a village of Vikrampur of another image inscription dated in the 12th regnal year of Govindacandra.

6. *Loc. cit.* Some scholars think that Uttara-Rāḍha has here been mentioned as the kingdom of Mahīpāla I. The language of the Tirumalai record however shows that the Cola army defeated Mahīpāla and reached Uttara-Rāḍha and the Ganges. This seems to indicate that Uttara-Rāḍha formed part (may be the major division) of Mahīpāla's kingdom.

7. Jarrett's translation, II, p. 120.

8. *Studies in Indian Antiquities*, pp. 187-88.

even today) in order to check the tides of floods in the southern part of Vaṅga which was low, abounding in streamlets, and nearer the sea. It is interesting in this connection to note that some parts (very probably the Buckerganj District and parts of the Faridpur District) of Southern Bengal were actually known as *nāvya* (a region accessible by boats) which seems to stand for the modern Bengali word *bhāti*, i.e. the southern region which is nearer the sea (from Bengali *bhātā*, tide, i.e. with the stream necessarily running towards the south to meet the Bay of Bengal). In this connection, the place called Vaṅgāla-baḍā-bhū in Rāmasiddhipāṭaka in the Nāvya region of Vaṅga in Viśvarūpasena's Sāhitya Pariṣat grant⁹ and identified with Bāṅgorā in the region of Rāmasiddhi in the Gaurnadī P.S. of the Buckerganj District is very interesting to note. It is therefore not impossible to think that the Buckerganj-Faridpur region of Vaṅga was originally known as Vaṅgāla and that it was recognised as a separate political unit only when in the 10th century the Candra dynasty founded a kingdom in Candradvīpa (=Bāklā Candradvīpa=Buckerganj District and the adjoining region) which seems to have roughly corresponded to Vaṅgāla.¹⁰ Dr. R. C. Majumdar¹¹ has recently identified Vaṅgāla-deśa with the district round Chittagong which he takes to have been the original seat of the Pālas and the Candras. The accounts of medieval European travellers referring to the "City or Port of Bengala" near modern Chittagong, on which Dr. Majumdar bases his theory, however do not appear to have any thing to do with the capital of the ancient Vaṅgāladeśa, the kingdom of the Candras in the 10th and 11th centuries A.D. The biggest port of medieval Bengal was situated near the mouths of the Padmā and the Meghnā, not far from modern Chittagong. Originally the medieval "City or Port of Bengala" seems to have signified "the city or port *par excellence* belonging to the country of Bengala (which term then roughly indicated the whole of Bengal)." ^{11a} It may moreover be pointed out that the Chittagong area did not probably form an integral part of the Mughal Subah of Vaṅgāla before the 17th century¹². Dr. Majumdar's theory regarding the original seat of the Pālas and the Candras again can hardly be conclusive until inscriptions of the dynasties are discovered in the

9. *Ins. Beng.*, III, p. 143 ff.

10. Raychaudhuri, *op. cit.*

11. *I. H. Q.*, XVI, p. 200.

11a. See my note on Vaṅgāla-nagarī in the *Śrī-Bhārati* (Bengali), Jyaiṣṭha, 1348 B.S., pp. 627-29.

12. Raychaudhuri, *loc. cit.*

Chittagong region or any definite evidence supporting the theory is available. But to make clear the position of the Candras in general and Govindacandra in particular we have to give an abstract account of the history of East Bengal from the 7th to the 12th century A.D.

The inscriptions of the Khadga kings may be palaeographically assigned to about the end of the 7th century A.D. and it is probable that the Vaṅga king who was the contemporary of king Yaśovarman of Kanauj (4th decade of the 8th century) belonged to the Khadga dynasty. Dr. R. C. Majumdar reads the date of the Ashrafpur grants of Devakhadga as year 73 and refers the year to the Harṣa era. But as Harṣa is known to have nothing to do with East Bengal, I am inclined to take the year (the reading of which is doubtful) as referring to Devakhadga's regnal year. This king lived upto a very old age as is proved by the Ashrafpur grant recording the gift of his son but bearing his own seal.¹⁴ One of the dates has been recently read as year 63.¹⁵

On the evidence of the Bādāl record (v. 2), Devapāla's Munghyr grant (v. 3), Bhoja's Gwalior *praśasti*, Karkarāja's Baroda grant, Bālāditya's Chātsū record, etc., I have tried to prove elsewhere¹⁶ that Gopāla the founder of the Pāla dynasty originally obtained a principality in Vaṅga or East Bengal about the middle of the 8th century. It is possible to suggest that in the 4th decade of the 8th century the Khadga power collapsed as a result of the defeat inflicted by Yaśovarman and that a chaotic condition prevailed in East Bengal for a short period. To end this *mātsya-nyāya*, the chiefs of the country helped Gopāla, who appears to have been a military chief like his father, to gain the throne.¹⁷ According to Tāranātha,¹⁸ the king, after whom the *mātsya-nyāya* ensued, belonged to the Candra family; it is however probable that the Tibetan historian has confused *Candra* with *Khadga*. The Pālas as I have shown elsewhere,¹⁹ gradually conquered many parts of Bengal and Bihar and soon transferred their capital to somewhere in North Bengal. That is possibly why a 12th

13. *J. P. A. S. B.*, XIX, p. 375 ff.; Bhandarkar, *List*, Nos. 1394, 1588.

14. Bhandarkar, *List*, No. 1590, note 3.

15. *Ibid.*, No. 1394.

16. *Proc. 2nd I. H. C.*, Allahabad, 1938, p. 194; *N. I. A.*, II, 1939, p. 383.

17. *Gauḍalekhamālā*, pp. 11-12, verses 3-4.

18. *I. H. Q.*, XVI, p. 200.

19. *Proc. 2nd I. H. C.*, *loc. cit.*; *N. I. A.*, *loc. cit.*

century work called *Rāmacarita* describes Varendrī (North Bengal) as the *janaka-bhū* of the contemporary Pāla king.^{19a}

According to the 12th verse of the Bāṅgaṅ grant²⁰ of the 9th year of Mahīpāla I (c. 992-1040), this Pāla king defeated a host of enemies and acquired his *pitrya-rājya* which had been *anadhikṛta-vilupta*. The expression *anadhikṛta-vilupta* may indicate "unconquered and thus lost" or "occupied by persons who are not lawful occupants." But the exact significance of the expression *pitrya-rājya* (paternal kingdom) is not easy to determine. It may indicate the whole kingdom of the forefathers of Mahīpāla I; or only Vaṅga (East Bengal) where the Pālas originally rose to power; or only Varendrī (North Bengal) which was considered in the 12th century as the *janaka-bhū* of the Pālas; or the major part of Mahīpāla's ancestral kingdom including both Varendrī and Vaṅga. Whatever the real significance of the expression may be, it is interesting to note that in the second half of the 10th century Vaṅga was under the rule of an independent king of the Candra dynasty.^{20a}

Four inscriptions of a Buddhist king named Śricandra have been discovered in the Vikrampur region and in "South" Vikrampur, at Rāmpāl in the Munshiganj and Dhullā in the Mānikganj Subdivision of the Dacca District and at Kedārpur and Edilpur in the Mādāripur Subdivision of the Faridpur District.²¹ The grants are issued from the Vikramapura-samāvāsita-jayaskandhāvāra and the Dhullā grant is dated in the king's 35th regnal year. The characters of the records have been proved to be earlier than the Bāṅgaṅ grant of Mahīpāla. Śricandra therefore ruled about the end of the 10th century A.D. Śricandra's records²² prove that the Candra family was originally enjoying (i.e. ruling) Rohitāgiri which has been identified by some with Rohtāsgarh in Shāhābād District, but by others with the Lālmāi hills in the Tippera District.²³ As it is now generally believed that the Candras of Bengal were connected with the Candras of Arakan, it is possible to think of Rohitāgiri as belonging to that region. It is also

19a. Of course *janaka-bhū* may simply mean "ancestral kingdom or a part of it."

20. *Gaudalekhamālā*, p. 95, v. 12.

20a. The passage in question is generally interpreted with reference to the occupation of parts of Bengal by the Kambojas whose records have been discovered at Bāṅgaṅ (Dinājpur Dist.) and Irda (Bālāsore Dist.).

21. *Ins. Beng.*, III, pp. 4 f.; 165 ff.

22. *Ibid.*, p. 4, verses 2 ff.

23. *Ind. Cult.*, II, p. 758.

not impossible that Rohitāgiri originally formed a part of Candradvīpa, i.e. the Buckerganj region including the adjoining *dvīpas* in the Bay of Bengal.^{23a} Whatever however the identification of Rohitāgiri may be, it is evident that the Candras were landlords of that place. In this Candra family was born a person named Pūrṇacandra who had a son named Suvarṇacandra. They were not kings. Trailokyacandra, son of Suvarṇacandra, became lord of Candradvīpa and the mainstay of the fortune of the king of Harikela. There can therefore be hardly any doubt that Trailokyacandra was the first king of the family and that he flourished as a feudatory of the king of Harikela²⁴ which is another name of Vaṅga according to the 12th century lexicographer Hemacandra.²⁵ This king of Harikela=Vaṅga, overlord of Trailokyacandra of Candradvīpa, was no doubt the contemporary Pāla king the original seat of whose family was Vaṅga. There are reasons to believe that the Puṇḍravardhana-bhukti which included Vaṅga during this period was being directly ruled from the Pāla king's capital somewhere in North Bengal. It is not known if Trailokyacandra remained faithful to his overlord all through his life; his son Parameśvara-Paramabhaṭṭāraka-Mahārājādhirāja Śricandra however is known to have ruled over the Vikrampur region in Vaṅga as an independent ruler. But we do not know whether he became independent of his overlord late in his reign. The Bhārellā inscription²⁶ discovered in the Tippera District is dated possibly in the 18th year of another Candra king named Layahacandra who may have been a successor of Śricandra. But whether he ruled over the whole of Śricandra's kingdom is not known.

The Bāghāūrā image inscription²⁷ is dated in the 3rd regnal year of a king named Mahīpāla who is generally identified with Mahīpāla I of the Pāla dynasty. If this identification be accepted, Mahīpāla I, true to his claim in the Bāngaṅ grant, may have recovered his fatherland Vaṅga from the Candras. In that case we have to suppose that the Candra power was revived by Govindacandra even during the lifetime of Mahīpāla I. This is proved by the joint evidence of the Paikpārā inscription under notice and the inscription of Rājendra

23a. The word *giri* does not always mean "a hill"; it also indicates "an elevation."

24. This meaning of the passage आधारो हरिकेलराजकुदञ्चस्मितानां त्रियां was first suggested to me by Prof. Raychaudhuri.

25. Raychaudhuri, *op. cit.*

26. *Ep. Ind.*, XVII, p. 351.

27. *Ibid.*, p. 355.

Cola I. Soon however Vaṅga again passed to the Pālas about the end of the reign of Govindacandra himself or during that of one of his successors. This is proved by the joint evidence of the *Rāmacarita* and a medical work called *Śabdapradīpa*. In the list of feudatories of Rāmapāla (c. 1084-1126)^{27a} given in the *Rāmacarita*²⁸ not a single of them is found to belong to East Bengal. This fact suggests that Vaṅga was under the direct rule of this Pāla king who lost North Bengal to the Kaivarttas and had the western part of his kingdom under the rule of his feudatories. According to the *Śabdapradīpa*,²⁹ the author's father was the court-physician of Rāmapāla lord of Vaṅga (*Vaṅgeśvara*), while his great-grandfather was a physician at the court of Govindacandra, doubtless the same as the king referred to in the Pāikpārā inscription. It is interesting to note in this connection that Vīgrahapāla III, father of Rāmapāla, is said in some records to have traversed the eastern region in course of his *digvijaya*.³⁰ It is therefore possible to suggest that it was Vīgrahapāla III who reconquered Vaṅga for a second time from the Candras. It must however be admitted that there is no inherent improbability in the identification of Mahīpāla of the Bāghāūrā inscription with Mahīpāla II (c. 1080-84 A.D.)³¹ of the Pāla dynasty, who was the eldest brother and a predecessor of Rāmapāla. In that case we may think of a continuous Candra rule in Eastern Bengal without any Pāla interregnum. The identification of Mahīpāla of the Bāghāūrā record with Mahīpāla II of the Pratihāra dynasty³² however is quite unconvincing, as the Pratihāras are known to have had nothing to do with Eastern Bengal.

Dr. N. K. Bhattasali thinks that Govindacandra is identical with king Gopīcand known from some Bengali and Panjabi ballads, a drama, and the tradition recorded by Tāranātha.³³ This Gopīcand

27a. A.D. 1120 suggested to be the date of Rāmapāla's death (*I.H.Q.*, XVII, p. 222) can by no means be accepted as established. There can be no doubt that in the interpretation of the significance of Govindapāla's *atīta-rājya* years, R. D. Banerji alone is right.

28. V. R. S. edition, pp. xxvi-xxviii.

29. *Ibid.*, p. xxiii.

30. *Gauḍalekhamālā*, p. 125-25, verse 14.

31. Though palaeography is not a sure guide in such cases, the characters of the Bāghāūrā record appear to be a little earlier than the end of the 11th century which is the time of Mahīpāla II.

32. *I. H. Q.*, XVI, p. 179 ff.

33. *Ibid.*, XVI. *loc. cit.*

is said to have been the son of Tilakcand and the ruler of Mṛkul, i.e. the Mehārkul Pargana of the Tippera District. If the identification of Trailokyacandra of the inscriptions and Tilakcand father of Gopīcand according to some legends as also the identification Govindacandra=Gopīcand be accepted, Govindacandra becomes probably a younger brother of Śricandra. In many points however the legends cannot be easily reconciled with one another and with the known facts of Candra history, and, though they may contain germs of historical truth, their evidence must remain doubtful unless corroborated by other independent sources. The revival of Pāla power in East Bengal after Govindacandra however may be at the root of the Tibetan tradition placing Gopīcand before the *mātsya-nyāya* ending in the accession of the first Pāla king.³⁴

We have seen that the Pālas were again ruling over Vaṅga after the Candras. The country or the major part of it seems to have passed to the new dynasty of Varmans even during the reign of Rāmapāla himself. These Varmans belonged to the Yādava clan and originally lived at Siṃhapura.³⁵ The only other Varman family, both belonging to the Yādava clan and ruling over Siṃhapura in the Panjāb, is known from the Lakkhāmaṇḍal inscription.³⁶ There can therefore be hardly any doubt that the Bengal Varmans were an offshoot of the Yādava Varmans of Siṃhapura in the Panjāb. A person named Vajravarman who was a leader of the Yādava army was born in the Varman family of Siṃhapura. His son Jātavarman is rightly supposed to have been the first king of the family.³⁷ He married a daughter of the Kalacuri king Karṇa (1041-72 A.D.) and was possibly a leader of Karṇa's army. He was probably with Karṇa's army, as I have suggested elsewhere,³⁸ when the latter conquered Aṅga (East Bihār) and advanced as far at least as the village of Pāikoṛ in the Bīrbhūm District.³⁹ The Belābo grant⁴⁰ says that Jātavarman spread

34. *Loc. cit.*

35. *Ins. Beng.*, III, p. 19, verse 3.

36. *Ep. Ind.*, I, p. 12 ff.

37. *Ins. Beng.*, III, p. 22, n. 4; cf. his comparison with Pṛthu "the first king" according to the Purāṇas.

38. *Proc. 2nd I. H. C.*, p. 198.

39. *A. S. I.*, 1921-22, pp. 80, 115.

40. *Ins. Beng.*, III, p. 20, verse 8. Note that Aṅga was the name of Pṛthu's grandfather. That the comparison with Pṛthu may have something to do with the Aṅga country was first suggested to me by Prof. Raychaudhuri.

rājya-srī in the Āṅga country. This fact seems to suggest that the Varman son-in-law for some time ruled Āṅga under his Cedi father-in-law. His political influence spread over North Bengal where he defeated Divya, the Kaivartta usurper of Varendrī, and over Assam.⁴¹ It should be noticed that Jātavarman is not known to have anything to do with East Bengal. The Pālas however soon recovered Āṅga possibly after the death of Karna and we find a Rāṣtrakūṭa chief named Mahana as governor of Āṅga under Rāmapāla.⁴² When the Varmans were ousted from Āṅga, they appear to have taken shelter somewhere in North Bengal. This is probably suggested by the facts that Jātavarman had political relations with North Bengal and that the Varmans appear to have held the Rājshāhī region as late as the time of Bhojavarman who granted land in the Kauśāmbī-gaccha which has been identified with Kuśumbā in the Rājshāhī Dist.⁴³ It is also very interesting to note that the *Rāmacarita* mentions one Hari as a friend of Bhīma, the Kaivartta king of North Bengal.⁴⁴ This Hari seems to be no other than Harivarman, son of Jātavarman. After the defeat of Bhīma, his friend Harivarman tried to check the Pāla advance with the remnant of Bhīma's forces; but he was very soon won over by Rāmapāla. Whether Harivarman got in this way his footing in East Bengal or conquered that region when Rāmapāla was engaged in the life and death struggle with Bhīma is not definitely known. He may have got parts or even the whole of the country from Rāmapāla as the price of his friendship. That he was ruling in East Bengal during the later years of Rāmapāla is suggested by another verse of the *Rāmacarita*.⁴⁵ A Ms. referring to the 39th regnal year of Harivarman⁴⁶ suggests a very long reign of this Varman king. This is again supported by the *Rāmacarita* which mentions Hari even in connection with the reign of Madanapāla (c. 1130-50).⁴⁷ His reign however possibly began before the acquisition of East Bengal by him. Harivarman was probably succeeded by his son who could not have ruled for a long period.^{47a} The next king was Sāmalavarman who

41. *Op. cit.*, verse 20.

42. *Rāmacarita*, p. xxv f.

43. *Ins. Beng.*, III. p. 19.

44. *Rām.*, p. xxx; xxxiii.

45. *Ibid.*, III, verse 44.

46. Bhandarkar, *List*, No. 1715 n.

47. *Rām.*, IV, verses 37, 40.

47a. Cf. v. 16 of Bhaṭṭa Bhavadeva's *praśasti*. The non-mention of the name of Hari's son in this verse and other Varman records may suggest that he was a minor and the *de facto* ruler was Sāmala who ultimately usurped the throne. It may also be conjectured that both uncle and nephew at first declared themselves kings in different parts of the kingdom and that Bhavadeva supported the latter.

was probably Haṛivarman's younger brother. Sāmalavarman seems to have been succeeded by Bhojavarman. Both of these kings possibly had short reigns. About the middle of the 12th century, the Senas ousted the Varmans and conquered East Bengal.

The Senas originally belonged to Kaṛṇāṭa. This is not only proved by the typical Kanarese name of *Ballāla-sena*, but also by explicit statements in the Sena inscriptions. Vīrasena, the ancestor of the Sena dynasty, was a *dākṣiṇāṭya-kṣaunḍra* or a Deccanese prince.⁴⁸ According to the Deopāṭā inscription,⁴⁹ the glory of Sāmantasena, born in the family of Vīrasena, was sung about the Bridge, i.e. Setu-bandha-Rāmeśvara. He was a Brahma-kṣatriya, that is to say, "born in a family of the male and female progenitors of which one was a Brāhmaṇa and the other a Kṣatriya." He has also been described as a Kaṛṇāṭa-kṣatriya and as a punisher of the enemies of the Kaṛṇāṭa-lakṣmī i.e. the royal fortune of the Kaṛṇāṭa country.⁵⁰ This apparently indicates that he came to the East in the train of the Western Cālukya army (under a prince like Vikramāditya VI) which may have attacked Eastern India jointly^{50a} with Kalacuri Kaṛṇa. Sāmantasena seems to have passed his last years on the banks of the Ganges in Rāḍha.⁵¹ The Barrackpore grant⁵² mentions Hemantasena, son of Sāmantasena, as *rājaraṁkṣā-sudakṣa* which seems to indicate that he was a feudatory of the contemporary Pāla king. Hemantasena's son was Vijayasena who also was originally a feudatory of the Pālas.^{52a} He secured his position by marrying a princess of the Śūra family, defeated the lord of Gauḍa i.e. the contemporary Pāla king, and thus became the first independent king of the family. The Barrackpore grant of Paramesvara-Paramabhaṭṭāraka-Mahārājādhirāja Vijayasena was issued from Vikramapura in the 62nd year of his reign.⁵³ He was apparently very old at that time and, as the 8th and 9th verses of the record sug-

48. *Ins. Beng.*, III, p. 46, verse 4.

49. *Ibid.*, p. 46 ff.

50. *Ibid.*, p. 47, verse 8.

50a. Cf. Ray, *D. H. N. I.*, II, p. 778.

51. *Ins. Beng.*, p. 47, verse 8.

52. *Ibid.*, p. 61 ff.

52a. Raychaudhuri identifies him with Vijayarāja of Nidrāvala, a feudatory of Rāmapāla, according to the *Rāmacarita*. The identification of Nidrāvala with the Nidrāli-gāi of the Vārendra Brāhmaṇas is not beyond doubt.

53. Bhandarkar refers the year to the Cālukya-Vikrama era and gets A. D. 1137-38 (*List*, No. 1682 note). The Senas of Bengal were also matrimonially allied with the Cālukyas. Rāmadevī, queen of Ballālasena, was a Cālukya princess. But the suggestion of Bhandarkar cannot explain why the Cālukya era has been used only once in the Sena records. Apparently Vijaya became independent late in life.

gest, the administration seems to have been actually controlled by his son Ballāla, born of his wife of the Sūra family. East Bengal was no doubt conquered from the Varmans, and it is not impossible that the list of princes like Vīra (Vīravarman ?), etc., vanquished by Vijaya-sena as given in the Deopārā record⁵⁴ may actually contain the name of one of Bhojavarman's successors whom we do not as yet know from any other source. It is however not necessary for us to go further with the history of East Bengal. What has been said is enough to show the position of the Candras and especially of Govindacandra in Vaṅga and Vaṅgāla.

Text⁵⁵ of the Pāikpārā Inscription

Line 1	(A) श्रीमद्गो-	(B) विन्दच-	(C) न्द्रस्य सम्यत् २३
Line 2	(A) रालजिक-उ	(B) परत-पा-	(C) रदास-सुतः
Line 3	(A) गङ्गादा-	(B) स-कारित-वा-	(C) सुदेव-
Line 4	(A) भट्टारक ⁵⁶		

Corrected Text

श्रीमद्गोविन्दचन्द्रस्य संवत् २३ ॥ रालजिकोपरत-पारदाससुत-गङ्गादास-
कारित-वासुदेव-भट्टारकः ॥

TRANSLATION

The year 23 of (the reign of) the illustrious Govindacandra. (This image of) Lord Vāsudeva (is) caused to be made by Gaṅgādāsa, son of the late Pāradāsa (and) an inhabitant of Ralaja (?).

54. *Ins. Beng.*, II, p. 48, verses 20, 21.

55. From estampages and eye-copies kindly supplied by Mr. J. N. Gupta.

56. Faint traces of a *visarga* may possibly be noticed after क in the estampage.

SOME CURE DEITIES

. By NANIMADHAB CHAUDHURI

It is proposed in the present paper to examine some instances of belief in the divine agency of cure as opposed to the magical agency among Hindus and Hinduised tribes. Magic has found a large scope in the science of cure from the very earliest times and it is a testimony to the hold of magic on man's mind that survivals of beliefs in curative magic are still to be found in the most advanced societies, lurking in forms not easily recognisable. Belief in magic in the field of curative practices, counter-acting the malign influence of evil spirits causing disease, destroying embryos etc., appears in the R̥gveda. Magic in all its forms assumes a preponderant importance in the Artharvaveda, and the large mass of Tāntrika literature is perhaps the best example of the striking efflorescence of magico-religious ideas in the sacred literature of the Hindus. But we are not concerned with magic even in the limited field of cure; we shall confine ourselves to instances of direct appeal to the divine agency for cure. There are also other agencies of cure which owe their potency to divinity through intimate association or transmission. Their potency is thus derivative potency. To this class of secondary divine agencies belong trees, tombs, certain animals, water, holy places (*tīrthas*) etc. It is not proposed in this paper to deal with these secondary agencies.

Along with belief in the magical agency of cure there is to be found in the R̥gveda also belief in the divine agency of cure.

Rudra is the healer god in the R̥gveda. He is invoked to cure diseases and distribute medicines.¹ He is the best among physicians.² He possesses a thousand remedies.³ Healing power is also attributed to the Aśvins. With medicines they gave eyes to Kaṇva and R̥jraśva who had become blind,⁴ cured leprosy,⁵ put in order fractured limbs, rejuvenated Cyavana.⁶ Their healing powers are almost forgotten later, though they are often referred to as physicians to the gods. Viṣṇu appears as the protector of embryos in the R̥gveda, but there

1. *R̥gveda*, 1. 43. 2, 4; 114. 1, 2, 5;

3. *Ibid*, 7. 46. 3.

5. *Ibid*, 1. 117. 7.

2. *Ibid*, 2. 33. 4.

4. *Ibid*, 1. 116. 16; 117. 8.

6. *Ibid*, 1. 117. 4; 116. 10,

does not appear any reference to his healing power. Dhanvántarī, the presiding deity of the Āyurvedic Science, appears in the epic⁷ and is recognised as an incarnation of Viṣṇu in the Purāṇas.⁸ No specific instance of his worship is known.

Rudra, whose healing powers are so highly praised in the Ṛgveda, is also a giver of death and disease. He is prayed not to destroy with his shafts the old among his worshippers, the young, the embryo in the womb, and their parents and not to inflict disease and injuries on them, their offspring, their kith and kin.⁹ He destroys both cattle and men.¹⁰ In the Atharvaveda and the Sūtras this malignant aspect of Rudra receives more attention than his healing powers. He attacks men with fever, cough and poison.¹¹ His Gaṇas attack men with death and disease.¹² Rudra has to be worshipped in a cattleshed for averting cattle disease.¹³ In the Mahābhārata Rudra-Śiva is connected with death and disease. His wrath produces fever.¹⁴ His healing power is not in evidence. The Viṣṇu and some other Purāṇas describe how in the fight between Kṛṣṇa and Vāṇa Daitya, Śiva created fever with one body, three heads and three legs to assist Vāṇa. This fever-demon got worsted in his fight with Kṛṣṇa. He took himself off declaring that those who would hear the story of his fight with Kṛṣṇa would be cured of fever.¹⁵ Rudra-Śiva's healing power receives very little attention in the Purāṇas. The Devī Purāṇa states that Śiva removes fever, insanity, rheumatism, piles, cough, possession by evil spirits etc.¹⁶ The Saura Purāṇa lays down that Śiva removes scrofula etc.¹⁷

Coming to the existing worship of Śiva among Hindus and Hinduised tribes we find that his healing powers have come to receive much attention. It is to be noted that this healing aspect of the god is not much in evidence in his domestic worship, but it is the

7. *Mahābhārata*, 12. ch. 208. (Bangavasi Edition).

8. *Brahmavaivartta Purāṇa*, *Śrīkṛṣṇajānamakhaṇḍa*, Ch. 51 (Bangavasi Edition).

9. *Ṛgveda*, 1. 114. 7, 8.

10. *Ibid*, 1. 114. 10.

11. *Atharvaveda*, 11. 2. 22.; 6. 90. 2.

12. *Sāṅkhāyana Śrauta Sūtra* iv. 19. 8. quoted by Macdonell, *Vedic Mythology*, p. 76.

13. *Āśvalāyana Gṛhya Sūtra*, IV. 8. 40; Pār. Gs. III. 8 etc.

14. *Mahābhārata*, *Santi P.*, ch. 14. 282.

15. *Viṣṇu Purāṇa*, Book 5, Ch. 33 vv. 14 f. (Bangavasi edition).

16. *Devī Purāṇa*, Ch. 7, vv. 71, 72 (Bangavasi edition).

17. *Saura Purāṇa*, Ch. 23, v. 58.

most important aspect in his worship at certain shrines. The most important of these shrines in Eastern India are those at Tarakeśwar and Gondalpārā in Hughly, Bengal, and at Vaidyanāthadhāma in the Santal Parganas. The Gondalpārā shrine is specially visited for cure of hydrophobia. "Syphilitic eruptions are believed to be cured by dropping rice, sugar and curds over the liṅga of Mahādeva, while dysentery and diarrhoea may be cured by pouring water on it."¹⁸ The Tārakeśwar and Vaidyanāthadhāma shrines are visited for cure, particularly of chronic and deadly diseases. The usual practice followed at these shrines in case of such diseases is to offer *dharaṇā* till some medicine is prescribed in dream. These shrines are visited by Hindus of all castes, the Vaidyanāthadhāma shrine being visited also by Hinduised Santals, Oraons etc. The worship is offered through a Brahman priest but *dharaṇā* is offered either by the patient himself or a near relative of the patient. In Gujerat Śiva is worshipped by dropping rice, sugar and curds over the liṅga for cure of syphilitic eruptions and piles and water is poured over the liṅga for cure of dysentery and diarrhoea. Śiva is worshipped also for the cure of scrofula.¹⁹ There are no special shrines which are visited for cure. There are many instances of Mahādeva represented by a wooden post or an earthen mound being worshipped by Hinduised tribes for cure of diseases in general. He is worshipped in the same capacity under such local names as Viranātha, Burhā Bābā etc. by Hinduised tribes and tribes in Rajputana, Central Doab etc.²⁰ Burhā Bābā is worshipped for cure of ringworms by some Rajputana Jats²¹. Coming back to Bengal we find that Śiva is worshipped under the name Pañcānana, vulgarly abbreviated into *Peñco*, for cure of infantile maladies. A foreign observer, writing over a century ago, noticed his worship in these words : "Punchanunu is worshipped by the lower orders who consider him as the destroyer of children. The image used as his representative is a misshapen stone anointed, painted and placed under the Vutu and other trees".²² Pañcānana is meditated on as wearing a tiger skin, three-eyed and with sacred thread and is invoked as the lord of diseases. The cult of Pañcānana is popular in parts of lower Bengal where many

18. Risley, *Tribes and Castes of Bengal*, Vol. I, p. 363.

19. *Gazetteer of Bombay Presidency*, Vol. IX, Part 1, 1901, p. 365.

20. William Crooke, *Tribes and Castes of North Western Province and Oudh*, Vol. II, pp. 39, 46.

21. *Ibid.*

22. W. Ward, *History, Literature and Mythology of Hindus*, Introduction, p. XCIII,

shrines of his known as Pañcānana talā are to be found.²³ Offerings are made by village people in case of serious illness in the family to Buro Śiva under which name Śiva is worshipped as a guardian deity of village in many parts of Bengal. At Benares a folk god known as Jvaraharīśvara is worshipped for cure of malaria. The special offerings made to him are *bhāṅg* and sweetmeats. The offering of *bhāṅg* to the god shows that he is regarded as a form of Śiva.²⁴ Mention may be made here of an old aspect of Śiva which is not much remembered now, namely, the aspect of curer of barrenness or giver of offspring. The Mahābhārata mentions several instances of the worship of Śiva under this aspect, one being that by Kṛṣṇa under the directions of sage Upamanyu, the propagator of the worship of the Liṅga. At the present time forms of the Devī, trees, tombs and in certain cases megalithic monuments are worshipped for the same purpose and objects possessing magical potency are also used.

It may be observed from the references given from the early sacred literature that Rudra-Śiva is given two diametrically opposite attributes, he is both a giver of disease and a healer of disease. These two contradictory strains in his conception continue all along. A very curious outgrowth, it would seem, of his aspect as a giver of disease is Skanda's connection with Kumāras and Mātṛs who are described in the Mahābhārata as the cause of infantile and juvenile diseases.²⁵ We shall again refer to these strains in Rudra-Śiva's conception when we examine instances of the worship of the Devī as a cure goddess.

In popular worship there does not occur any instance of the worship of Viṣṇu as a cure god. A stray case of the worship of a folk god known as Jvaranārāyaṇa is reported from Khulna (Senhati) for cure of fever.²⁶ There are in fact only a few instances of local deities being affiliated to Viṣṇu-Kṛṣṇa and these have an agricultural aspect. There is, however, one important folk deity affiliated to Nārāyaṇa whose worship, widely popular in Bengal, may be said to have some connection with cure of disease, averting of evil etc. This is Satya Nārāyaṇa or Satya Pīr, whose cult is known in Bengal, Bihar, the United Provinces etc.

In the pre-epic, epic, and Puranic accounts of the Devī and her

23. *Kriyākāṇḍavāridhi*, published by the Basumati Publishing House, Vol. I, p. 749.

24. Crooke, *Popular Religion and Folklore of Northern India*, 1896, Vol. I, p. 136.

25. *Mahābhārata*, Vana P., Chs. 228, 229.

26. Hunter, *Statistical Account of Bengal*, Vol. II, p. 223.

forms there does not appear to be any reference to her special healing powers. As we turn to her popular worship it is found that under different Puranic names she is worshipped for cure of different diseases, but it is mainly in cases of epidemic outbreaks of cholera and small-pox that her worship is most popular. A number of local deities worshipped for cure in such cases are affiliated to her by the use of composite names and recognised as her forms. There are, again, some folk deities who are regarded as her forms though not explicitly affiliated to her.

Thus *Jagadambā* is worshipped as a small-pox goddess in Patna and south-east Bihar by the Dosadhs. *Mahāmāyā* is also worshipped as a small-pox goddess.²⁷ In Chatrisgarh *Kālīkū-Bhawānī* is the small-pox goddess. She is regarded also a cholera goddess by the Saiqualgars (U.P.), and when cholera rages a goat is sacrificed to her.²⁸ *Bhawānī* is worshipped by the Kunbis (Poona) for cure in all illness.²⁹ In Muzaffarnagar *Kālī Devī* is worshipped during an epidemic.³⁰ *Kālī*, *Mahākālī*, and *Ugra-Kālī* are the different names under which the *Devī* is worshipped when cholera prevails in South India.³¹ *Kālī* or *Bhagavatī* is invoked in times of illness by the Pulayans.³² Fowls are offered by the Koodans to *Bhagavatī* in epidemic outbreaks of cholera and small-pox.³³ *Bhadra-Kālī* is worshipped by the Kaniyans in case of similar outbreaks.³⁴ The following extract from a leading Bengali paper shows that human sacrifice to the *Devī* for purpose of cure has not altogether disappeared. "A coolie of Nagakhuli tea-garden in Dibrugarh, Assam, was suffering great hardships on account of poverty and his wife and children were suffering from various maladies for several years. One day the coolie had a dream that if he could propitiate the *Devī* by offering her the sacrifice of a boy these hardships and maladies would disappear. Accordingly, he sacrificed his five-year old nephew to the goddess, buried him, planted a bamboo on the spot and worshipped the *Devī*. The boy's mother made enquiries about him in the evening and was told by the village chowkidar that the boy had been seen in the company of his uncle. The uncle failed to give satisfactory replies when he was asked about the

27. George A. Grierson, *Bihar Peasant Life*, 1885, pp. 404, 406.

28. Crooke, *Tribes etc.*, Vol. IV, p. 258.

29. *Rgveda*, iv. 25. 16.

30. Crooke, *Popular Religion etc.*, Vol. I, p. 142.

31. Bishop Whitehead, *Village Gods in South India*, p. 32.

32. L. K. Ananta Krishna Iyer, *Cochin Castes and Tribes*, pt. i, p. 113.

33. *Ibid*, p. 136.

34. *Ibid*, p. 223.

whereabouts of the boy. The dead body was discovered after some searches were made. The man was arrested and sent up for trial.”³⁵

Local goddesses of disease are sometimes affiliated to the Devī by the use of composite names. In Bengal the popular Puranic name of the Devī used for such purposes is *Caṇḍī*. Thus we have *Ulāi-Caṇḍī* who is worshipped in South and Central Bengal as the cholera goddess. “At Birnagar or Ula (24 Parganas) the *Ulāi-Caṇḍī* festival is held in June or on the last day of Baisākh in honour of the *Ulāi-Caṇḍī*, one of the forms of the wife of Śiva, as the goddess of cholera.”³⁶ The goddess is revered also by Moslems who call her Ula or Ola Bibi. In North Bengal the goddess worshipped in case of an outbreak of cholera is *Rakṣā-Kālī* who is offered pūjā by Brahman priests in a temporary shrine built at cross-ways. At some places *Śmaśāna-Kālī* is worshipped for the same purpose. When a cholera epidemic broke out among the army of coolies working at the construction of the Hardinge Bridge over the Padma at Sara Ghat, Pabna, and the coolies were so panic-stricken that breakdown was feared, the Labour Contractor, with handsome contributions from the European architect in charge, arranged for the worship of *Śmaśāna-Kālī* on a grand scale. In Burdwan *Basana-Caṇḍī* is worshipped as the goddess of cholera and small-pox.³⁷ We have seen that the Vedic literature prescribes worship of Rudra for averting cattle-disease. It is reported from Sylhet (Assam) that Hindus worship *Ghorā-Caṇḍī* in case of an outbreak of cattle epidemic.³⁸ The Tharus (Bihar and Upper India) worship *Dhara-Caṇḍī* for the same purpose. She is offered fowls.³⁹ The worship of two folk goddesses *Abāk Caṇḍī* and *Kalāi-Caṇḍī* is reported from Midnapore. A fair is held in honour of *Kalāi-Caṇḍī* at Bhadutala, two miles from Midnapore. According to our informant these goddesses are worshipped in the hope of recovery from diseases and clay animals are offered to them.⁴⁰ *Kakāi-Caṇḍī* has a shrine at a village called Badala in Hughly, Bengal. She is said to be worshipped for cure of jaundice.⁴¹ *Nātāi-Caṇḍī* and

35. A United Press report published in *Ananda Bazar Patrika* a leading Bengali paper published from Calcutta.

36. Hunter, op. cit., Vol. ii, p. 57.

37. Reported by Miss Hemalata Lahiri, Burdwan, Bengal.

38. P. Bhattacharyya Vidyavinode, *Folk customs and folklore of Sylhet, Man in India*, Vol. X, Nos. 2-4, p. 150.

39. Risley, op. cit., Vol. ii, p. 317.

40. Reported by Mr. K. C. Chakravartti, B.L., Midnapore, Bengal.

41. Rajnarain Bose, *Grāmya Upākhyāna* (in Bengali), p. 9.

Kului-Candī worshipped in parts of Eastern Bengal appear to be folk goddesses occasionally worshipped for cure purposes but without connection with any specific disease. *Āṅārmatī-Bhawānī* is worshipped by the Dhakars (U.P.) who believe that sunstroke is due to her. She is believed to ride through the sky in her chariot in hot weather.⁴²

There are other goddesses whose affiliation is not secured by any such device as the use of composite names. Thus there is *Bahucārjī* whose worship is popular in Gujerat. The goddess is visited by the lame, blind, impotent and childless. "They draw near her temple and remain seated near the sacred pond of Mansarovar touching no food until they fancy that they have heard the goddess promising them the accomplishment of their desires."⁴³ She is regarded as a form of Bhawānī or the Devī and is worshipped in the Brahmanical form.⁴⁴ According to an account of the origin of this deity she is a deified Charan woman who killed herself to protect her honour.⁴⁵ *Revatī* (temple at Badali) regarded as a form of the Devī is visited by the lame, blind, paralytic and stammering.⁴⁶ The *Mātā* is worshipped as a small-pox goddess by the Dhuniyas (Upper India).⁴⁷ The Kalhatis (Poona) worship *Mārāi* as the cholera goddess. She is worshipped also by the Uchilas.⁴⁸ *Viśālī Devī* regarded as a form of Durgā is worshipped for the cure of sore eyes.⁴⁹ The Kanjars worship *Mahārānī Devī* regarded as a form of the Devī for cure.⁵⁰ *Mārī Mātā*, *Mārī-Bhawānī*, or *Mārīśvarī* worshipped among many Hinduised tribes in Northern and Western India and regarded as a form of the Devī is *Mariyāmmā* worshipped on the outbreak of epidemic in the Tamīl districts in South India. She is identified with Bhagavatī.⁵¹ *Kulumaiāmmā* (Trichinopoly) and *Pollyāmmā*, cholera and small-pox goddesses, are regarded as forms of Kālī.⁵² The Chamars and the Muchis (Bihar and Upper India) worship *Jalkā Devī* in case of an outbreak of cholera epidemic. A swine is sacrificed to her by

42. Crooke, *Tribes etc.*, Vol. ii, p. 286.

43. Bombay Presidency Gaz., Vol. ix, pt. i, p. 366.

44. *Ibid*, Vol. vii, p. 609 f.

45. *Rās Mālā*, ii, p. 90.

46. B. P. Gaz., Vol. ix, pt. i, p. 366.

47. Crooke, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, p. 47.

48. B. P. Gaz., Vol. ix, pt. i, pp. 458, 470.

49. Crooke, *op. cit.*, Vol. iii, pp. 81 f.

50. B.P. Gaz., Vol. ix., pt. i, pp. 323, 516; Crooke, *op. cit.*, Vol. iii, p. 145; Vol. iv, p. 74.

51. Iyer, *op. cit.*, p. 164.

52. Whitehead, *op. cit.*, p. 100; Iyer, *op. cit.*, p. 164.

rājya-srī in the Aṅga country. This fact seems to suggest that the Varman son-in-law for some time ruled Aṅga under his Cedi father-in-law. His political influence spread over North Bengal where he defeated Divya, the Kaivartta usurper of Varendrī, and over Assam.⁴¹ It should be noticed that Jātavarman is not known to have anything to do with East Bengal. The Pālas however soon recovered Aṅga possibly after the death of Karna and we find a Rāstrakūṭa chief named Mahana as governor of Aṅga under Rāmapāla.⁴² When the Varmans were ousted from Aṅga, they appear to have taken shelter somewhere in North Bengal. This is probably suggested by the facts that Jātavarman had political relations with North Bengal and that the Varmans appear to have held the Rājshāhī region as late as the time of Bhojavarman who granted land in the Kauśāmbī-gaccha which has been identified with Kuśumbā in the Rājshāhī Dist.⁴³ It is also very interesting to note that the *Rāmacarita* mentions one Hari as a friend of Bhīma, the Kaivartta king of North Bengal.⁴⁴ This Hari seems to be no other than Harivarman, son of Jātavarman. After the defeat of Bhīma, his friend Harivarman tried to check the Pāla advance with the remnant of Bhīma's forces; but he was very soon won over by Rāmapāla. Whether Harivarman got in this way his footing in East Bengal or conquered that region when Rāmapāla was engaged in the life and death struggle with Bhīma is not definitely known. He may have got parts or even the whole of the country from Rāmapāla as the price of his friendship. That he was ruling in East Bengal during the later years of Rāmapāla is suggested by another verse of the *Rāmacarita*.⁴⁵ A Ms. referring to the 39th regnal year of Harivarman⁴⁶ suggests a very long reign of this Varman king. This is again supported by the *Rāmacarita* which mentions Hari even in connection with the reign of Madanapāla (c. 1130-50).⁴⁷ His reign however possibly began before the acquisition of East Bengal by him. Harivarman was probably succeeded by his son who could not have ruled for a long period.^{47a} The next king was Sāmalavarman who

41. *Op. cit.*, verse 20.

43. *Ins. Beng.*, III. p. 19.

45. *Ibid.*, III, verse 44.

47. *Rām.*, IV, verses 37, 40.

42. *Rāmacarita*, p. xxv f.

44. *Rām.*, p. xxx; xxxiii.

46. Bhandarkar, *List*, No. 1715 n.

47a. Cf. v. 16 of Bhaṭṭa Bhavadeva's *praśasti*. The non-mention of the name of Hari's son in this verse and other Varman records may suggest that he was a minor and the *de facto* ruler was Sāmala who ultimately usurped the throne. It may also be conjectured that both uncle and nephew at first declared themselves kings in different parts of the kingdom and that Bhavadeva supported the latter.

Kului-Candī worshipped in parts of Eastern Bengal appear to be folk goddesses occasionally worshipped for cure purposes but without connection with any specific disease. *Angārmātī-Bhawānī* is worshipped by the Dhakars (U.P.) who believe that sunstroke is due to her. She is believed to ride through the sky in her chariot in hot weather.⁴²

There are other goddesses whose affiliation is not secured by any such device as the use of composite names. Thus there is *Bahucārjī* whose worship is popular in Gujerat. The goddess is visited by the lame, blind, impotent and childless. "They draw near her temple and remain seated near the sacred pond of Mansarovar touching no food until they fancy that they have heard the goddess promising them the accomplishment of their desires."⁴³ She is regarded as a form of Bhawānī or the Devī and is worshipped in the Brahmanical form.⁴⁴ According to an account of the origin of this deity she is a deified Charan woman who killed herself to protect her honour.⁴⁵ *Revatī* (temple at Badali) regarded as a form of the Devī is visited by the lame, blind, paralytic and stammering.⁴⁶ The *Mātā* is worshipped as a small-pox goddess by the Dhuniyas (Upper India).⁴⁷ The Kalhatis (Poona) worship *Mārāi* as the cholera goddess. She is worshipped also by the Uchilas.⁴⁸ *Viśālī Devī* regarded as a form of Durgā is worshipped for the cure of sore eyes.⁴⁹ The Kanjars worship *Mahārānī Devī* regarded as a form of the Devī for cure.⁵⁰ *Mārī Mātā*, *Mārī-Bhawānī*, or *Mārīśvarī* worshipped among many Hinduised tribes in Northern and Western India and regarded as a form of the Devī is *Mariyāmmā* worshipped on the outbreak of epidemic in the Tamil districts in South India. She is identified with Bhagavātī.⁵¹ *Kulumaiāmmā* (Trichinopoly) and *Pollyāmmā*, cholera and small-pox goddesses, are regarded as forms of Kālī.⁵² The Chamars and the Muchis (Bihar and Upper India) worship *Jalkā Devī* in case of an outbreak of cholera epidemic. A swine is sacrificed to her by

42. Crooke, *Tribes etc.*, Vol. ii, p. 286.

43. Bombay Presidency Gaz., Vol. ix, pt. i, p. 366.

44. *Ibid*, Vol. vii, p. 609 f.

45. *Rās Mālā*, ii, p. 90.

46. B. P. Gaz., Vol. ix, pt. i, p. 366.

47. Crooke, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, p. 47.

48. B. P. Gaz., Vol. ix, pt. i, pp. 458, 470.

49. Crooke, *op. cit.*, Vol. iii, pp. 81 f.

50. B.P. Gaz., Vol. ix., pt. i, pp. 323, 516; Crooke, *op. cit.*, Vol. iii, p. 145; Vol. iv, p. 74.

51. Iyer, *op. cit.*, p. 164.

52. Whitehead, *op. cit.*, p. 100; Iyer, *op. cit.*, p. 164.

the Chamars. She is worshipped also by the Muchis in Bengal. Risley thinks that she is perhaps identical with Rakṣā-Kālī worshipped in Bengal villages.⁵³ *Ujālī Mātā* identified with the Devī is worshipped in Muzaffarnagar when children get small-pox or scrofulous neck.⁵⁴ At Malaypur in Birbhum a block of stone installed under a banyan tree is worshipped as goddess *Basanta-Bairī* (enemy of small-pox).⁵⁵

It will be observed from the above that the important disease in connection with which the Devī generally in the form of Kālī or local deities affiliated to her is worshipped, is cholera. A few instances of worship being offered on an outbreak of small-pox epidemic occur mainly in South India and some stray cases occur here and there. Other diseases for the cure of which worship is offered are paralysis, lameness, scrofulous neck, sore eyes etc. Two instances of worship for cure of cattle disease are reported from Assam and Bihar. Now Kālī in her different names such as Ugra-Kālī, Rakṣā-Kālī, Bhadrakālī etc. and Caṇḍī are demoniacal forms of the Devī. Mārī, according to the Vāmana Purāṇa, is also a demoniacal form of hers (*Mārī triśūlena jaghāna cānyān khaṭṭāṅgapātair aparāṃśca kauśikī* etc.).⁵⁶ It is these demoniacal or destructive forms that are worshipped for cure of epidemic cholera and other less serious diseases.

There is an exception to the almost universal worship in India of female deities affiliated to the Devī for cure of cholera. This is Harda or Harduar Lala, the cholera god whose worship prevails in the U.P. districts north of the Jumna. He belongs to the class of deified heroes. It may be noted that in Bundelkhand, his native land, Harda is worshipped as a marriage god.⁵⁷ In South India where female deities regarded as forms of the Devī are generally worshipped in case of outbreak of cholera there is a male deity Śaṣṭhā receiving worship in the same contingency. He is regarded as a form of Śiva.⁵⁸

We may now turn to the "specialist" cure deities. Though a few cases occur of the worship of forms of the Devī for cure of small-pox, specially in the South, *Śītālā* is the deity pre-eminently worshipped for cure of small-pox from Assam to Baluchistan and from the Himalayas to the Vindhya. The Skanda Purāṇa makes her responsible for small-pox, boils, scrofula etc. She is described as a goddess

53. Risley, *op. cit.*, Vol. i, pp. 97, 179.

54. Crooke, *Popular Religion etc.*, Vol. 1, p. 127.

55. Article by S. Chakravartti in *Bhāratavarṣa, Aśāḍha*, 1347 B.S.

56. *Vāmana Purāṇa*, ch. 52.

57. Crooke, *Popular Religion etc.*, Vol.

i, p. 138.

58. Iyer, *op. cit.*, pp. 313-314.

mounted on an ass, naked, carrying a broomstick and a pitcher and with a winnowing fan on her head etc. These attributes of the goddess and the existence, side by side, of her worship in the Brahmanical and non-Brahmanical forms point to her true origin, namely, that she is a folk goddess who has been Brahmanised. In the non-Brahmanical worship the Hādis, Doms, Bhangis etc. forming the lowest castes of Hindus are her hereditary priests. The Mochis offer a pig to her "first of all smearing the animal's snout with red lead and repeating certain incantations after which it is set free, and any one may seize it."⁵⁹ Śītalā is said to be the eldest of a band of seven sisters by whom particular diseases are controlled e.g. Śītalā, Maśānī, Mahākālī, Polamde, Āgwanī etc. (U.P.). They are all of a demoniacal nature.⁶⁰

It is generally supposed that Śītalā is derived from Hāritī of the Buddhist texts. Atkinson writes that in the hills Śītalā is represented as a woman dressed in yellow with an infant in arms. The late MM. Haraprasad Sastri wrote, "It is difficult to ascertain whether Hindus have taken Śītalā from the Buddhistic Hāritī or the Buddhists from the Hindu Śītalā. I am inclined to think that Hindus are the borrowers, because they always call her a goddess and a form of Kālī, but the Buddhists call her a yakṣiṇī."⁶¹ The Buddhistic Hāritī, however, has no connection with small-pox. She was a demoness feeding on children but received into grace by the Master.^{61a} Her story occurs in the Vinaya Piṭaka of the Sarvāstivāda School preserved in the Chinese translation.⁶² In the Tibetan account Hāritī is "the queen of Pretas with the fiery mouth" who fed her 500 children on living children. "Food is offered to Hāritī and her sons before it is taken by the Lamaist Church. . . Each Lama daily leaves on his plate a handful of food to these demons and these leavings are ceremoniously gathered and thrown outside the monastery gate. . . . In the Japanese version of this legend the Buddha told Hāritī that she was a king's daughter and performed many meritorious acts, but because she had not kept

59. Risley, *op. cit.*, Vol. II, p. 97.

60. Crooke, *Introduction to the Popular Religion and Folklore of Northern India*, 1894, p. 80.

61. Atkinson, *Himalayan Gazetteer*, ii, p. 300.

61a. H. P. Sastri, *Discovery of Living Buddhism in Bengal*, p. 20.

62. J. N. Banerji, *Indian Historical Quarterly*, Vol. XIV, No. 1, 1938, p. 103.

the precepts she had become a demon.”⁶³ “The cult of Hārītī had a long history of its own both in and outside India. We learn from the Si-Yu-Ki of Hiuen Tsang how her cult was acclimatised in ancient Gandhara . . . and how her worship migrated outside India to eastern China (through Chinese Turkestan and Kashmir), Korea and Japan.”⁶⁴ What is however of importance to notice is that Hārītī is not the only one of her class; *yakṣiṇī Kālī*, *rakṣiṇī Kuṇḍalā* etc. mentioned in the Buddhist texts were semi-divine ogresses devouring children, belonging to the same type as Hārītī. Rākṣasī Jarā from whom Jarāsandha derived his name⁶⁵ is the Brahmanical counter-part of the Buddhistic Hārītī. As Mr. J. N. Banerji points out,⁶⁶ there are more affinities between Jyeṣṭhā, a South Indian folk goddess whose worship is now almost extinct, and Śītalā, than between Hārītī and Śītalā. One fundamental objection to the view that Śītalā is derived from Hārītī is that in art and in texts Hārītī is always represented as carrying a child in her arms, and as a mother of many children. This representation can only mean that through the grace of the Lord, Hārītī the yakṣiṇī, a destroyer of children, became a protectress of children. Through the development of this aspect in her character Hārītī allies herself to Ṣaṣṭhī the goddess of child birth and protectress of children who is also represented as carrying a child in her arms (*kroḍe vinyastaputram*).

Without pursuing the question further it may be stated that the conception of Śītalā, her cult as it is practised in many parts of the country and the absence of any mention of her in the Purāṇas—she is mentioned only in the late Skanda Purāṇa and Pichila Tantra—all point to her rise from a folk goddess of demoniacal type.

The universal desire among all classes of Hindus, to which reference has been made, to affiliate all sorts of female folk deities to the Devī is manifest in the case of Śītalā also. “Tilothu village in Sasaram sub-division is situated 5 miles east of a gorge by which the Tutrahi river leaves the hills. This spot is sacred to Śītalā. The chief object of interest is an image . . . which is said to have been placed here by the Cheros. It represents a many-armed female striking down a man as he springs from the neck of a buffalo.”⁶⁷ The Dhan-

63. L. A. Waddell, *Buddhism of Tibet or Lamaism* 1895, p. 99 and Note.

64. J. N. Banerji, *op. cit.*, p. 104.

65. *Mahābhārata*, *Sabhā P.*; ch.

18, vv. 1-6.

66. Banerji, *op. cit.*, pp. 105, 106; T. A. G. Rao, *Hindu Iconography*, Pt.

II, p. 395.

67. *Imperial Gazetteer, Provincial Series, Bengal*, Vol. II, p. 75.

gars of Mirzapur affiliate Śītalā to the Devī by giving her the composite name Śītalā-Bhawānī.⁶⁸

Gujarat has two local deities worshipped for cure of small-pox, e.g. *Kakabalia* worshipped by the Gujarāt Bhils and Dharampur Varlis,⁶⁹ and *Said Kākā* worshipped in case of epidemic small-pox. He is supposed to live in a stone or stone bust said to be that of Ghaṭotkaca, son of Bhīma. His carrier is a donkey.⁷⁰

Śītalā has a few other functions besides curing small-pox. Among the Lodhis in Poona the girl's mother worships Śītalā on the marriage day.⁷¹ The shrine of the goddess at Raewala in Dehradun is visited by women to procure children.⁷²

The presiding deity of itch, boils etc. has a fairly wide-spread cult in Bengal. A distinction is, however, made between the itch-god and the boil-god in some parts of Bengal. In lower and Western Bengal the itch-god is *Gheṇṭu* who is purely a folk-deity without any pretension to respectability. The boil-god is *Ghaṇṭākarna* who is recognised as a Gaṇa of Śiva in the Śiva Purāṇa. He is represented by a ghaṭa or earthen pot. He is invoked as follows :—

Ghaṇṭākarna mahāvīra sarvavyādhivināśanaṃ

Viśphotakabhayaaprāpte rakṣa rakṣa mahābala.⁷³

The earthen pot used is generally an old blackened pot used to fry rice which is ceremonially broken with a stick after worship. This ceremonial splitting of a pot is an instance of sympathetic magic. The worship of Ghaṇṭākarna prevails also in the hills where his character as an attendant of Śiva is better recognised and he is given the position of a gate-keeper of temples. The cult of Gheṇṭu which prevails in Lower and Western Bengal is confined to boys. A mound of earth shaped into a cone decked with wild gheṇṭu flowers and put into a piece of sheath of plantain tree with an earthen lamp burning before it, represents the deity. Clay images of elephant, horse etc. are put by the side of the mound. A number of boys carrying the deity on the shoulder visit houses in the village singing songs in honour of Gheṇṭu and collecting gifts of rice, money etc. The songs are to the effect : "From wherever Gheṇṭu passes by itch flees away. Come Gheṇṭu riding an elephant." The songs meant for the householders who are asked to make gifts to the god are not bene-

68. Crooke, *Tribes etc.*, vol. ii, p. 269.

69. B. P. Gaz., Vol. ix, Pt. 1, pp. 292, 329.

70. *Ibid.*, p. 329.

71. *Ibid.*, vol. xviii, Part 1, p. 399.

72. Crooke, *Popular Religion etc.*, Vol. 1, p. 127.

73. Śabdakalpadruma, vol. ii, p. 278.

dictory,—a threat is held out to those that are disposed to give little that the god will give them seven daughters, a threat likely to prove quite effective on fathers in Bengal. With the things collected the young devotees give themselves a feast.

In parts of North Bengal the itch deity is a goddess called *Basanvari*. She is represented by a plantain tree. A piece of new cloth dyed in turmeric is wrapped round it, a nose-ring and ear-rings are stuck into the sheath and a pith crown is tied to the top leaf of the tree. Eyes and face of the goddess are drawn with soot mixed with oil and vermilion and round marks are put on different parts of the tree with lime to represent itches. The worship is offered by little boys and girls. Plantain, rice, sugar and wild flowers (*banyā*, *kātāgar*, *kāyādimā* etc.) are offered. The goddess is immersed in a tank on the last day of Caitra after being formally worshipped by a priest. Songs sung in chorus by the young devotees are intended to pander to the vanity of the deity,—“My father is bad, *Vasanvari* is good, my brother is bad, *Vasanvari* is good” and so on. In parts of Central Bengal the itch goddess is called *Viṭākumārī*. She is worshipped in the month of Māgha. Around a cone-shaped mound of earth are arranged four flat-topped mounds of earth. Worship is offered by little boys and girls with wild flowers (*bhantī*, *śimula* etc. not offered to other deities). The mantra is a song sung in chorus to the following effect :—“Go away this time o goddess, with itches and boils, come back with shell bracelets and vermilion” etc.

Chondu is regarded as an itch deity by the Kols. No details about his worship are available.

There is no doubt that “specialist” folk cure deities of this type and many others worshipped for cure are known to Brahmanical Hindus, Hinduised tribes and tribes not Hinduised, but we have not been able to collect detailed information regarding these. To show how wide-spread the cult of cure deities is mention is made below of the names of a few :

- 1) Acheri is a god worshipped in the U.P. for cure of cold and goitre.
- 2) Alopi is worshipped in case of epidemic outbreaks in the U.P.
- 3) Ai Thansi is a goddess worshipped in Kathiawar for cure of cough.
- 4-5) Berai and Mārākī (Gujarat and the U.P.) are worshipped in epidemic outbreaks.
- 6) Birahi is a minor small-pox deity worshipped in the U.P.
- 7-9) Bangara is the Kol deity of fever, Gohem of cholera and Nigra of indigestion.

- 10) Bhane Ghane is the goddess of cattle disease worshipped by the Marias (C.P.).
- 11) The goddess Fulkai is worshipped in Gujerat for cure of barrenness.
- 12) Gosawan is the god of cattle disease among the Gōalas in Bihar.
- 13) Hāḍakai is the goddess who cures hydrophobia (Gujerat).
- 14) Juśrī Mātā cures cattle pox in Kathiawar.
- 15) Kara Sarna is the god of cattle pox worshipped by the Kharias (Chota Nagpur).
- 16) Kokkalāmmā is a South Indian goddess who cures cough.
- 17) Mutua Deo cures fevers in the U.P.
- 18) Nagar Sen is an U.P. disease godling among the Dhobis.
- 19) Rāhu is worshipped by the Dosadhs (Bihar) for cure of fever and other diseases.
- 20) Susime is the goddess curing blindness and lameness among the Garos.
- 21) Sukhajāminā is worshipped for cure of measles in the South.
- 22) Sunkalāminā is worshipped for the same purpose in Bellary.
- 23) Tarara-Rabenga is worshipped by the Garos for cure of Kala-Azar etc.
- 24) Untai (Gujerat) cures whooping cough.⁷⁴

The foregoing is more or less in the nature of a catalogue of different deities worshipped for cure. There will be found in it some references to the representations of some of these deities and methods of their propitiation. Representations of deities sometimes vary according to the status of the deities and the status of their devotees. Thus the old deities Śiva and the Devī in her Puranic forms when worshipped for cure by Brahmanical Hindus are represented in their Puranic forms. When they are worshipped by Hinduised tribes low in the social scale the representations are sometimes the same but sometimes the iconic representation of forms of the Devī gives place to aniconic representation by blocks or slabs of stone. Thus a stone block is worshipped as Bhagavatī, Kālī, Mahākālī etc. in the South. At the same time non-Brahmanical elements are introduced in the

74. The above list has been compiled from various sources e.g. *Tribes and Castes of North-Western Province and Oudh* and *Popular Religion and Folklore of Northern India* by W. Crooke; *Village gods in South India* by Bishop Whitehead; *Religious Life and Thought in India* by Monier Williams; *Tribes and Castes of Bengal* by H. Risley; *The Garos* by Playfair; *Descriptive Ethnology of Bengal* by Dalton; *Bihar Peasant Life* by Grierson; *The Cochin Tribes and Castes* by L. K. Anantha Krishna Iyer etc.

methods of propitiation, that is to say, the priest is a non-Brahman and non-orthodox sacrifices are offered. When they are worshipped by tribes open to Hindu influence but not Hinduised the stone *līṅga* of Śiva is replaced by stone slabs or pebbles or wooden posts and the Devī is represented similarly by stone slabs or blocks or mounds of earth. The method of propitiation consists of offer of unclean animals like pig, birds like fowl, libations of spirits through a tribal priest. In the case of local or folk deities affiliated to Mahādeva and the Devī or her Puranic form Kālī, Brahmanical Hindus do not generally change either the representation or the form of worship. Thus Ulāi-Canḍī, Kakāi-Canḍī etc. are represented as Kālī and worshipped in the Brahmanical form, Peñco or Pañcānana is often represented and always worshipped as Śiva. It is not much different in the case of independent folk deities like Śītālā ; but in her case both Brahmanical and non-Brahmanical systems of worship prevail side by side and iconic representation appears also outside the Brahmanical society. It may be pointed out in this connection that mere transference from the iconic to the aniconic representation may not indicate much if it is unaccompanied by other significant changes, because both iconic and aniconic representation of deities are worshipped by Brahmanical Hindus and even in the case of a widely worshipped goddess like the great Durgā, the gorgeous image is freely replaced by a *ghaṭa* or an earthen water-pot filled with water and with a cocoanut and mango twigs at the top. At Vindhychal in the famous shrine of Vindhya-vāsinī, the goddess, a form of the Devī, is represented by a stone slab.

In the case of folk deities without Puranic affiliations, there is no uniformity of ideas and a study of the differences in representations will be of great ethnological interest ; but for the purpose of such study a mass of details has to be collected and examined. In the case of tribal cure deities the representation is not different from other tribal deities and does not call for any remark.

With regard to the method of worship the principle is generally the same though varying in details. Whether the priest is a Brahman or a casteman among Hinduised tribes or a tribesman among tribes and the sacrifices are orthodox or non-orthodox, the underlying idea is to propitiate the deity and to induce him to grant the required relief. A striking departure from the usual mode is hurling of abuse at the goddess Bhagavatī and desecration of her shrine reported by Mr. Anantha Krishna Iyer.⁷⁵ This is the method of coercion often practised by spirit-doctors in exorcism.

75. Iyer, *op. cit.*, p. 238.

Two of the diseases for which direct intervention of the divine agency is sought are cholera and small-pox epidemics which affect large masses of men creating havoc and spreading panic. Others affect individuals, such as lameness, blindness, sunstroke, sore throat, hydrophobia, fever, paralysis, itches etc., and therefore cause no panic in a community. Direct intervention is also sought for cure of barrenness, removal of impotence etc. It is to be noted that with the exception of Śiva and local deities affiliated to him the deities invoked for cure are nearly all female. That cure deities should be conceived of as female is undoubtedly significant and should, perhaps, be attributed to a general tendency to mother-goddess worship among the devotees. It should again be noted that the general tendency is to affiliate local or folk female cure goddesses to the Devī, or more precisely, to her Puranic form Kālī, despite the fact that there is little Puranic evidence of healing powers being attributed to her. Most of the female cure deities have a fearful or demoniacal aspect. To take the case of Śītālā. Her conception with all the uncouth details is not at all pleasing, rather it is likely to inspire dread and create aversion. Different forms of Kālī, Mārī, Marīśvarī, Pollyāmmā etc. have all a demoniacal aspect. This aspect cannot be regarded as a survival of the original condition of these deities as demonesses or evil spirits; the evidence in the sacred literature regarding the origin of Kālī does not justify such inference. It is possible that this aspect owes its origin to a recognition of these deities or their prototype Kālī as a giver as also a curer of diseases. Here is a case of an outbreak of plague being attributed to the wrath of the Devī: "An outbreak of plague at Craganore (Cochin State) is attributed by villagers to the wrath of the goddess Bhagavathī. A temple at Craganore, dedicated to the goddess, is visited annually by thousands of pilgrims. During pilgrimage time, a Moplah entrusted a small bundle to a pilgrim to be delivered at the temple as an offering. The pilgrim, opening the bundle, found that it contained hair, fowl's feathers and other articles. Annoyed he threw the bundle into the temple and called upon the goddess to retaliate against the Moplah's sacrilegious deed.

"The plague epidemic is believed to have originated in the house at Craganore of the Moplah who sent the bundle.

"The people have now decided to propitiate the goddess."
(From *Statesman* of 27. 4. 35.)

The method of propitiating these deities is the common method of prayer and offer of sacrifices, it has nothing in common with exorcism or spirit-doctoring except perhaps in a solitary instance referred

to above in which coercion in the form of abuse is used. The cults of most of the cure deities have thus two elements as their basis, the element of fear in the power of evil and the element of faith in the benevolence of these deities who inspire dread.

These two apparently contradictory elements characterise the old cult of Rudra-Śiva, as has been noted, and the later cult of the Devī. The Devī has a dreadful lefthand aspect and a beneficent righthand aspect. Kālī is a lefthand form of hers. She is a destroyer, but a destroyer of the evil. When she is pleased she removes all afflictions (*rogān aśeṣān apahaṃsi tuṣṭū*, *Caṇḍī* II. 28). Attention has been drawn to the tendency to affiliate local or folk deities to the Devī. This tendency illustrates in its unconscious working a general desire to elevate deities of humble origin to a higher rank through such affiliation. There is also another tendency noticeable among Hinduised tribes and tribal peoples to degrade deities with Puranic affiliations to the status of casteless folk or tribal deities. Both these tendencies illustrate in their working how folk and tribal religions react to the pressure of Brahmanical Hinduism.

AN IMPORTANT ASPECT OF PATAÑJALIAN TECHNIQUE OF INTERPRETATION

By K. MADHAVA KRISHNA SARMA

The use of a good many Paribhāṣās and Nyāyas (some of which are of his own making) not only leads Patañjali to reject a large number of Vārttikas, but also enables him to widen the scope of the Aṣṭādhyāyī. A few among these are illustrated below.

(1) व्याख्यानतो विशेषप्रतिपत्तिर्न हि सन्देहादलक्षणम् ।

When Pāṇini uses an ambiguous term its precise meaning is to be ascertained from authoritative interpretation. Pāṇini's grammar which as a Śāstra should teach definite things, does not, because of some ambiguous terms, become Alakṣaṇa, i.e. unauthoritative. From authoritative interpretation we learn that the Pratyāhāra 'Aṇ' is formed with 'ṇ' of the first Sūtra of the Akṣarasamāmnāya except in P. 1.1. 69.¹ Pāṇini who instead of using different sounds occasions ambiguity by employing the same letter in both अइउण् and लण् whenever 'Aṇ' and 'In' are used, intends, according to Patañjali, to teach this important maxim. Patañjali makes use of this Paribhāṣā in various ways. In fact the interpretations which he places upon a good many Sūtras and which enable him to reject a number of Vārttikas can be explained by reference to this Paribhāṣā. A few illustrations are given below.²

(a) P. 1. 4.9. (विप्रतिषेधे परं कार्यम्) says that when there is opposition between two Sūtras both of equal force, the one that holds good is that which is read later.

This is the first interpretation. In certain cases which require the application of the Sūtra read earlier, Kātyāyana who does not go beyond this interpretation has to add Vārttikas to say that in those

1. See Patañjali on this Sūtra.

2. For other instances see the Mahābhāṣya on 1. 3. 10, 1. 3. 11, 3. 2. 57, 3. 2. 58, and 7. 1. 13. In all these places Patañjali points out that an authoritative interpretation removes all doubts :

सन्देहमात्रमेतद्भवति । सर्वसन्देहेषु चेदमुपतिष्ठते-व्याख्यानतो विशेषप्रतिपत्तिः..... ।

particular instances the Pūrva holds good. To Patañjali 'para' means not only 'read later' but also 'Iṣṭa', i.e. that which is demanded by the occasion. All the Vārttikas which Kātyāyana intends as exceptions to P. 1. 4. 9 are rejected by Patañjali following this latter interpretation. On P. 1. 4. 2. (V. 7) Patañjali says : अस्तीष्टवाची परशब्दः । तद्यथा—परं धाम गत इति । For instances see the Mahābhāṣya on P. 4. 1. 85, 5. 1.2, 6.1.12, 6.1.158, and 7.1.1.

(b) *Interpretation of the particle 'ca'.*

The interpretation of the particle 'ca' as demanded by the occasion often leads Patañjali to refute the Vārttikas. In P. 2.1.48 (पात्रे-समितादयश्च) and 2.1.72 (मयूरव्यसकादयश्च) he takes 'ca' as standing for the meaning of 'eva'; but in P. 2.2.14 (कर्मणि च) he takes it as conveying the sense of 'iti'. All this exemplifies the above maxim.

(c) *The meanings of 'anta'.*

Patañjali says that this word has two meanings, viz. 'Avayava' and 'Samīpa' and that in 1.2.10 (हलन्ताच्च) Pāṇini uses it in the latter sense i.e. 'Samīpa.' Thus he is able to answer an objection raised against this Sūtra by some of his predecessors who take it here in the former sense.³

(d) *The use of bahulam, anyatarasyām, etc.*

Pāṇini's grammar is Sarvavedapāriṣada; as such it cannot always cling to strictly uniform methods and devices. It has to make use of such words as 'bahulam', 'anyatarasyām', 'vā', etc. in order to account for all irregularities.

अवश्यं खल्वप्यस्माभिरिदं वक्तव्यं बहुलमन्यतरस्यामुभयथा एकेषामिति । सर्ववेदपारिषदं हीदं शास्त्रम् । तत्र नैकः पन्था शक्य आस्थातुम् ।—so says Patañjali on P. 2.1. 58 and 6.3.14.

The interpretation of 'bahulam', 'anyatarasyām', etc. as required by the occasion enables Patañjali⁴ to account for all irregularities. Kātyāyana who on both these Sūtras says बहुलवचनस्यावृत्तत्वात्, takes 'bahula' in its original sense which is 'mostly'.

Explanation of Vedic anomalies.

The irregularities in the use of case-affixes, personal endings, Para-

3. See the Mahābhāṣya on the Sūtra.

4. See Patañjali on P. 2. 1. 58 and 6. 3. 14.

smaipada and Ātmanepada terminations, etc. are so numerous in the Vedic language that it is not possible for a few rules to cover them all. Pāṇini treats them only in a cursory manner. Patañjali, according to whom Pāṇini's grammar is Sarvavedapāriṣada (2.1.58) finds in Pāṇini a justification for all these anomalies. He splits व्यत्ययो बहुलम् (P. 3.1.85) into two Sūtras : 'Vyatyayaḥ' and 'Bahulam'. The former, in accordance with the context, enjoins the interchangeability of Vikaraṇas in certain Vedic instances. The latter, i.e. Bahulam, is not bound by the context and means that all rules take effect diversely in the Vedic language. All Anomalies are thus explained by 'bahulam'.

सुनिडुपग्रहलिङ्गनराणां कालहलच्चरकर्त्तृयङां च ।

व्यत्ययमिच्छति शास्त्ररुदेपां सोऽपि च सिद्ध्यति बाहुलकेन ॥⁵

As has already been pointed out, Pāṇini uses 'bahulam' in its original sense⁶ viz. 'often'. Devices like the above which are intended to cover anomalies, give it later a very liberal sense, viz. 'diversely'. Hence the later commentators say :

क्वचित्प्रवृत्तिः क्वचिदप्रवृत्तिः क्वचिद्विभाषा क्वचिदन्यदेव ।

विधेर्विधानं बहुधा समीक्ष्य चतुर्विधं बाहुलकं वदन्ति ।⁷

(e) यथा न दोषस्तथास्तु ।

When two alternatives present themselves to us and the Śāstra (Pāṇini) does not expressly say which we should choose, we (as intelligent human beings) must adopt only that which is faultless. If a rule is capable of two interpretations, we have to choose that one which does not land us in any difficulty. Patañjali reiterates this axiom very often in the Mahābhāṣya and rejects⁸ a good number of Vārttikas.

(f) अधिकारा अनुवर्तेरन् ।

Refuting the Vārttika वदः सुप्यनुपसर्गग्रहणम् (P. 3.1.106, V. I)

5. By Upagraha are meant the Ātmanepada and Parasmaipada terminations. Yaṅ here is a Pratyāhāra with the ya of P. 3.1.22 and the 'ṇ' of 3.1.86. Examples are found in the Mahābhāṣya on P. 3.1.85.

See also Patañjali on 1.4.9 and 2.1.32.

6. Kātyāyana also says : बहुलवचनस्याकृत्वत्वात् . See also P. 2.1.58 and 6.3.14.

7. See Prakriyāprasāda of Viṭṭhala, Part II, p. 599 (Bombay Prakṛt and Sans. Series ed.).

8. See Patañjali on 1.4.57, 4.1.85, 2.4.12 etc.

which states that 'anupasarga' must be added to this Sūtra Patañjali says :

न वक्तव्यम् । अनुपसर्ग इति वर्तते । एवं तर्ह्यन्वाचष्टेऽनुपसर्ग इति वर्तते इति । नैतदन्वाख्येयमधिकारा अनुवर्तन्त इति । एष एव न्यायो यदुताधिकारा अनुवर्तेरिति ।

What Patañjali exactly means is this that instead of saying that Adhikāras do follow, it must be said that Adhikāras may follow as and when they are required. The Adhikāras can thus be taken over to any distant Sūtra even without connecting them with the intervening Sūtras. The application⁹ of the Adhikārasūtras is thus liberalised by Patañjali to a great extent.

अधिकारो नाम त्रिप्रकारः ।

Patañjali gives a wider sense to 'adhikāra' and recognizes three classes of it as follows :

(1) That which like a lamp stands in a corner of the Śāstra and illumines the whole of it. By this Patañjali means Paribhāṣās. The Mahābhāṣya on P. 2.1.1 makes this very clear :

परिभाषा पुनरेकदेशस्था सती सर्वं शास्त्रमभिज्वलयति प्रदीपवत् ।¹⁰

(2) That which is dragged by 'ca' from one Sūtra to another as a log of wood is drawn by a chain or rope.

(3) That in which the necessity of repeating the same word in every Sūtra with which it has to be connected, is not felt. This is the usual Adhikāra which is connected uniformly with the desired number of Sūtras following it.

Though 'śāṣaḥ' in P. 6. 4. 34 (शास इदङ्गलोः) stands for Avayava-ṣaṣṭhī, it can be taken over to the next one and interpreted as Sthāna-ṣaṣṭhī. Its repetition in the next rule is thus avoided. This Adhikāra falls into the third category.

This threefold definition of the Adhikāras enlarges their scope and they are used as required¹² by the occasion. Patañjali thus rejects the Vārttika विशिष्टा वा षष्ठी स्थानेयोगा । Says he :

9. Vide also Patañjali on 6.1.20 and 6.1.17.

10. Cf. also Patañjali on 2.4.34 : अथवा मण्डूकगतयोऽधिकाराः । तथैव मण्डूका उत्कृष्टोत्कृष्ट्य गच्छन्ति तदधिकाराः ॥

11. See Vol. I, p. 359, (Kielhorn's edition).

See also Patañjali on 8.3.37 (V. 2) and 5.1.1.

12. See also Patañjali on P. 8.3.37 (V. 2) and 5.1.1.

तद्यदेष पक्षोऽधिकारः प्रतियोगं तस्यानिर्देशार्थं इति । तदा हि यदेवाद
पुरस्तादवयवषष्ठ्यर्थमेतदुत्तरत्वानुवृत्तं सत्स्थानेयोगार्थं भविष्यति ।

(P. 1. 1., 49, V.4)

(2) सत्यपि संभवे बाधनं भवति ।

According to Kātyāyana an Apavāda (special rule) supersedes an Utsarga (general rule) when there is a conflict between the two, i.e. when there is no possibility of both taking effect together. According to Patañjali an Apavāda supersedes and Utsarga even when there is no conflict between them, i.e. even when there would be room for the operation of the Apavāda after the taking effect of the Utsarga. Patañjali quotes the Takrakaṇḍīnya maxim in support of his view :

सत्यपि संभवे बाधनं भवति । तद्यथा—दधि ब्राह्मणेभ्यो दीयतां तक्रं
कोण्डिन्यायेति सत्यपि संभवे दधिदानस्य तक्रदानं निवर्तकं भवति..... ॥

(Patañjali on P. 6. 1. 2, V. 4).

When it is said 'Let curds be given to Brāhmaṇas, but buttermilk to Kaṇḍīnya', Kaṇḍīnya is given only buttermilk, although it is possible to give him both curds and buttermilk, the one after or before the other. The following is an illustration :—

एकाचो द्वे प्रथमस्य (P. 6.1.1): In a root containing a single vowel the first syllable is reduplicated.

अजादेर्द्वितीयस्य (P. 6.1.2): In a root beginning with a vowel and consisting of more than one syllable, the second syllable is reduplicated. This is an exception to the first rule.

In the case of a root which begins with a vowel, the first rule is superseded by the second, although it is possible for the latter to take effect after the operation of the former.¹⁴ In instances like aṭi-ṭiṣati, aśiṣiṣati, etc. there is a possibility of both taking effect (अस्ति च संभवो यदुभयं स्यात्) ।

13. See Kaiyaṭa on 2.3.1 and the Paribhāṣenduśekhara, Paribhāṣās 52 and 58. Kaiyaṭa says :

विरोधे बाधकारणं न विशेषविधानमेव । वार्तिककारस्य चेदं दर्शनम् । भाष्यकारस्तु विरोधाभावेऽपि विशेष-
विधानमात्रेणैव बाधकत्वमन्यत्रावोचत् । तक्रदानं च दधिदानस्य विरोधाभावेऽपि लोके बाधकं दृश्यते ॥

14. E.g. aṭiṭiṣati, aśiṣiṣati, etc., desiderative forms of aṭ, aś, etc., which begin with a vowel. When the desiderative affix san and the augment iṭ are added to them they cease to be monosyllabic.

Patañjali says :

यदप्युच्यतेऽसति खल्वपि संभवे बाधनं भवति अस्ति च संभवो यदुभयं
स्यादिति नैतदस्ति । सत्यपि संभवे बाधनं भवति । तद्यथा दधि ब्राह्मणेभ्यो दीयतां
तक्रं कौण्डिन्यायेति । सत्यपि दधिदानस्य संभवे तक्रदानं निवर्तकं भवति ।
एवमिहापि सत्यपि संभवे प्रथमद्विर्वचनस्य द्वितीयद्विर्वचनं बाधिष्यते ॥

(P.6.1.2, V.4)

For other examples see the Mahābhāṣya on P.6.2.1, 6.4.163, 7.1.72 and 7.4.61. In all these instances Patañjali adopts this Takra-kaunḍinya maxim and makes it the main item of his difference with Kātyāyana.

(3) *The Sūtrasāṭaka maxim.*

Both Kātyāyana and Patañjali are agreed on the Nityatva of Śabdas. The acceptance of this doctrine helps us to overcome the Anyonyāśraya (interdependence when either of the two things cannot be known apart from the other) in many cases. For instance, when Pāṇini says वृद्धिरादैच् we are faced with an Anyonyāśraya ; the term Vṛddhi can be introduced only if the sounds ā, ai and au to which it applies, already exist ; on the other hand, the existence of these sounds becomes cognisable only when they are taught through the use of the term Vṛddhi. To solve the riddle it is accepted that Śabdas are Nityas. In other words, it is the Saṃjñās which are Anityas¹⁵ and which are newly taught here and not the Śabdas which are Nityas and to which these Saṃjñās apply.

But¹⁶ a difficulty is felt in instances like इयणः संप्रसारणम् (P.1.1.45) in which certain sounds receive a Saṃjñā only when they replace their respective Sthānins. For instance, Ik receives the Saṃprasāraṇa-saṃjñā only when it replaces Yaṇ. When we say that Ik receives the Saṃprasāraṇasaṃjñā when it replaces Yaṇ, the statement seems to be absurd because at this stage Ik has yet to come into existence by replacing¹⁷ Yaṇ. Ik must be there if it is to be made the Uddeśya

15. Cf. Patañjali on P. 2.1.51 (V. 4) : न हि संज्ञा नित्या ।

16. Cf. Patañjali on P. 1.1.45 (V. 3) : नेदं तुल्यमन्यैरितरेतराश्रयैः । न हि तत्र किञ्चिदुच्यतेऽस्य स्थाने य आकारैकारौकारा भाव्यन्ते ते वृद्धिसंज्ञा भवन्तीति ॥

17. The replacement of one sound by another sins against the doctrine of Immutability of Śabdas. Sūtras like इको यणचि (6.1.77) etc. have therefore to

of the Saṁprasāraṇasaṁjñā. Kātyāyana has no solution for this. But Patañjali who intelligently recognizes the difference between Saṁjñās of this type and those of the type of Vṛddhi introduces the Sūtraśāṭaka maxim to solve the difficulty mentioned above. What this maxim means is this: When one asks the weaver to weave a piece of cloth out of some yarn, one is indulging in what is a *prima facie* absurdity. The use of the word cloth presupposes the existence of a piece; so if it is a piece of cloth that is referred to, weaving is both unnecessary and impossible; if what is to be woven is yarn, then the piece of cloth need not be mentioned at all. The real explanation of this is that the word cloth is used in a prospective (Bhāvi) application; it is used rather to refer to the finished product which is non-existent when the weaver is given the instruction.

(4) व्यपदेशिवदेकस्मिन् ।

Patañjali widens the scope of its application.

This maxim is very frequently used by the Pāṇinīyas. It is favoured by both Kātyāyana and Patañjali. Kātyāyana¹⁸ uses it to mean that a part is treated as a whole. If a dog loses its tail, it does not cease to be a dog: it does not become a different animal. In his

be interpreted thus: When there is occasion (Prasakti) for the use of Ik, etc. Yaṇ, etc. must be used.

Cf. सर्वे सर्वपदादेशा दाक्षीण्यस्य पाणिनेः ।

एकदेशविकारे हि नित्यत्वं नोपपद्यते ॥

So there is no actual replacement but only the use of इक्, etc. when there is occasion for that of Yaṇ, etc. It is really the Prasaṅga that is Anitya and not the Śabda concerned. The immutability of Śabdās does not solve the riddle of Saṁprasāraṇasaṁjñā because Ik becomes Saṁprasāraṇa only after it is used in a case in which there was Prasaṅga for Yaṇ and not before. In Sūtras like व्यङ्गः संप्रसारणं पुत्रपत्योस्तत्पुरुषे (P. 6. 1. 13) in which it is said that Saṁprasāraṇa must be used in those instances where there is a Prasaṅga for Yaṇ, this term is used in a prospective application.

18. See P. 6.1.1 (V. 2): एकवर्णेषु व्यपदेशिवद्वचनात् ।

Even one vowel is treated as an Ekāc (Bahuvrihi) meaning a Samudāya or an Avayavin of which an Ac or a vowel is a part, e.g. iyāya, the Liṭ form, in which the root 'i' (to go) is reduplicated (एकाचो द्वे प्रथमस्य), being treated as an Ekāc.

Bhāṣya on the Vārttika लक्ष्यलक्षणे व्याकरणम्¹⁹ which means that 'Vyākaraṇa' stands for the totality of both Lakṣya and Lakṣaṇa, Patañjali says that the principle of Vypadeśivadbhāva justifies the use 'व्याकरणस्य सूत्रम्' ।

The difference between this and the other usual instances,²⁰ though very subtle, is nevertheless very important. In all other instances of Vyapadeśivadbhāva the wholeness of a thing is superimposed on its part and the part is consequently treated as a whole. But in this case the same²¹ thing is spoken of both as an Avayavin and an Avayava. The possessive case always indicates the relation of two actually different things. Kaiyaṭa²² gives another example, viz. राहोः शिरः²³ ।

Patañjali thus widens the scope of the application of this principle by using it in an instance in which the same thing is spoken of both as an Avayavin and an Avayava.

(5) एकान्ता अनुबन्धाः and अनेकान्ता अनुबन्धाः ।

Kātyāyana gives both but Patañjali accepts only the former.

Under P. I.3.9. Kātyāyana and Patañjali give the Paribhāṣās एकान्ता अनुबन्धाः and अनेकान्ता अनुबन्धाः, i.e. as the Anubandhas are or are not part of that to which they are attached. Kātyāyana on assuming that Anubandhas do not form part of the terms to which they are attached but merely stand beside them, is confronted with a difficulty in rules like P. 4.2.80 (वृञ्छणकञ्जिलसेनिरदृञ्णय.....) etc. in which 'ṇ', on account of its equal proximity to both the following and preceding affixes, would be connected with both and consequently the operation which results from an affix having the indicatory letter 'ṇ' would take place both in the case of 'ch' and in that of 'k'. The Vārttikakāra gives this solution for the difficulty: सिद्धं तु व्यवसितपाठात् । Patañjali explains: सिद्धमेतत् । कथम् ? व्यवसितपाठः कर्तव्यः । वृञ् छण्... । What Kātyāyana means is that they (the affixes referred to above) must be read distinctly, i.e. without blending the indicatory letter of one

19. Paspasā 14.

20. As that given in foot-note no. 18 in which 'i' is treated as an Ekāc.

21. Vyākaraṇa and Sūtra mean the same thing. See Patañjali on the Vārttika लक्ष्यलक्षणे व्याकरणम् ।

22. See the Mahābhāṣya, Pradīpa and Uddyota on the above Vārttika.

23. According to mythology, Rāhu is Dragon's Head; so both refer to the same thing.

affix with the other and confusing their functions. But Patañjali does not admit the necessity for this Vyavasitapāṭha. He thinks that the difficulty can be overcome through right interpretation. Says he :

सन्देहमात्रमेतद्भवति । सर्वसन्देहेषु चेदमुपतिष्ठते—व्याख्यानतो . विशेषप्रतिपत्तिर्न हि
सन्देहादलक्षणमिति व्याख्यास्यामः ।²⁴

Though Kātyāyana gives both the views, Patañjali accepts only the former which he thinks is more reasonable²⁵ than the latter.

Patañjali : उभयमिदमनुबन्धेषूक्तमेकान्ता अनेकान्ता इति । किमत्र न्याय्यम् ।

एकान्ता इत्येव न्याय्यम् ।²⁶

(6) सूत्रे लिङ्गवचनमतन्त्रम् ।

In Sūtra 1. 2.53 (तदशिष्यं संज्ञाप्रमाणत्वात्) Pāṇini himself points out that the gender and number of a word depend on usage and that no hard and fast rule can be laid down by grammar with regard to them. The same latitude can with all justification be extended to the words of his own Sūtras which are placed by him in genders and numbers having no grammatical importance. But as regards those of these latter Kātyāyana is sometimes very particular as in his critical Vārttikas on P. 3.3.18 (given below) and sometimes not as in his Vārttika on P. 4.1.92 : तद्धितार्थनिर्देशे लिङ्गवचनमप्रमाणं तस्याविवक्षितत्वात् ।

Patañjali lays down this definite maxim and holds to it throughout.

What this maxim—सूत्रे लिङ्गवचनमतन्त्रम्—means is this :—

We can have neither grain without chaff nor words without gender and number. When a word used to state a rule is placed by Pāṇini in a particular number and gender, these last have no grammatical importance ; the word can as well be in any other number or gender. The acceptance of this axiom leads Patañjali to reject Kātyāyana in some places. The following is an instance.

P. 3.3.18. भावे ।

Kātyāyana : सर्वलिङ्गो निर्देशः ।

Patañjali : भावे सर्वलिङ्गो निर्देशः कर्तव्यः । भूतौ भवने भाव इति ।
किं प्रयोजनम् । सर्वलिङ्गे भावे पते प्रत्यया यथा स्युरिति । किं पुनः कारणं न सिद्धति ।

24. See Patañjali on P. 1.3.9, V. 14.

25. See Patañjali on P. 1.3.9, V. 15 and 3.1.94, V. 6.

26. See P. 1.3.9, V. 15.

पुंलिङ्गेनायं निर्देशः क्रियते एकवचनान्तेन च । तेन पुंलिङ्ग एव भाव एकवचने चैते प्रत्ययाः स्युः । स्त्रीनपुंसकयोर्द्विवचनबहुवचनयोश्च न स्युः ।

नात् निर्देशस्तन्त्रम् । कथं पुनस्तेनैव च नाम निर्देशः क्रियते तच्चातन्त्रं स्यात् ॥ तत्कारी च भावांस्तद्वेषी च । नान्तरीयकत्वाद्वा पुंलिङ्गेन निर्देशः क्रियते एकवचनेन च । अवश्यं कयाचिद्विभक्त्या केनचिच्च लिङ्गेन निर्देशः कर्तव्यः । तद्यथा—कश्चिदान्नाथीं शालिकलापं सतुषं सपलालमाहरति नान्तरीयकत्वात् ।

(7) संनियोगशिष्टानामन्यतरापाय उभयोरप्यभावः ।

When one of the two things taught together disappears, then the other follows suit. When we say that this work must be done by Yajñadatta and Devadatta, we mean that it must be done together by both. The one does not do it in the absence of the other. This is another Paribhāṣā which Patañjali uses to make up the deficiencies in the Sūtras. According to him this is suggested by P. 6.4.153 :—

बिल्वकादिभ्यश्छस्य लुक्²⁷ ।

Pāṇini's object in having the augmented form 'bilvaka' in this Sūtra is to teach that 'cha' alone shall be elided and not the augment kuk : otherwise the augment 'kuk' would also be elided on the strength of this maxim. 'Bilva' becomes 'bilvaka' when the augment is added to it according to P. 4.2.91. नडादीनां कुक्च would have been quite sufficient. The force of the admission of the augmented form is that it alone shall be elided and not the augment added together with it. Under P. 4.1.36 Kātyāyana points out the necessity of stating that Āgamas and Ādeśas taught together with some Strīpratyayas follow suit when the latter are dropped. Patañjali thinks that such a statement is not necessary as it is a matter that may be learnt from everyday life. Says he : तत्तर्हि वक्तव्यम् ? न वक्तव्यम् । संनियोगशिष्टानामन्यतरापाय उभयोरप्यभावः । तद्यथा—देवदत्तयज्ञदत्ताभ्यामिदं कर्तव्यम् । देवदत्तापाये यज्ञदत्तोऽपि न करोति ।²⁸

(8) शब्दान्तरस्य प्राप्नुवन्विधिरनित्यो भवति ।

A rule is Anitya if the wordform to which it applies differs from what it was before another simultaneously applying rule took effect. This is another important maxim introduced by Patañjali. In the formation of 'nyaviśata', P. 6.4.71 which enjoins the augment 'at' and P. 3.1.77 which enjoins the Vikaraṇa 'śa' apply simultaneously. If

27. Vide the Mahābhāṣya on 2.2.6, 2.1.36, 2.2.29, 2.4.12 and 5.4.16,

28. See also Patañjali on P. 5.1.64 (Vol. II, p. 357).

Vikaraṇa is added first to the root the augment would be prefixed to viśa and not to viś, i.e., to that which ends with the Vikaraṇa ; otherwise it would be added only to viś ; hence P. 6.4.71 is said to be Anitya.

This Paribhāṣā enables Patañjali to regulate²⁹ the application of some Sūtras and leads him to reject some Vārttikas. Instances are found in the Mahābhāṣya on P.1.3.60 (V.3), 2.4.85 (V.3), etc.

(9) प्रत्येकं वाक्यपरिसमाप्तिः and समुदाये वाक्यपरिसमाप्तिः ।

Patañjali champions the latter and accounts for certain compounds.

Kātyāyana says that the addition of 'saha' to P. 2.1.4 सह सुपा is to indicate that the term Samāsa applies to a compound (a group of words) as a whole and not to individual parts thereof. According to him, in the absence of this word in this Sūtra, the term Samāsa would, like the term Vṛddhi taught in वृद्धिरादैच् P.1.1.1, apply to the individual parts of a compound. The Vārttikakāra thus champions प्रत्येकं वाक्यपरिसमाप्तिः (individual application) in his following Vārttika on P. 2.1.4 :

सहवचनं पृथगसमासार्थम् ।

Patañjali explains :

सह ग्रहणं क्रियते सहभूतयोः समाससंज्ञा यथास्यादेकैकस्य माभूदिति । कथं च कृत्वैकैकस्य वृद्धिसंज्ञा प्राप्नोति । प्रत्येकं वाक्यपरिसमाप्तिर्दृष्टेति ।

Patañjali does not agree with Kātyāyana. He points out to the latter that in certain cases rules have also collective application, e.g. गर्गाः शतं दण्डयन्ताम् । When it is ordered by a king that the Gargas shall be fined one hundred coins what is meant is that the total fine to be collected from all the Gargas must be one hundred and not that each Garga should be made to pay a fine of one hundred coins. The number of the coins is more important than the number of Gargas. An unimportant thing is repeated as many times as required by the number of important things to which it is applied but not *vice versa*.³⁰

अर्थिनश्च राजानो हिरण्येन भवन्ति । न च प्रत्येकं दण्डयन्ति ।³¹

29. In accordance with this Paribhāṣā.

30. This Nyāya is well-known among Mīmāṃsakas,

31. See also Patañjali on P. 1.1.1 (V. 12).

After criticising Kātyāyana in this way Patañjali shows 'how a better purpose can be served by 'saha' in the Sūtra. He splits the Sūtra into two : 'Saha' and 'Supā.' The former, i.e. Saha, means that Sup is compounded with any word that is Samartha. This³² covers all such compounds in which one member is not Sup (but is Samartha, i.e. connected in sense) and for which Pāṇini has no rules to account for, e.g., 'punarutsyūta' 'punarniṣkṛta,' etc. Patañjali thus extends the scope of the Samāśas.

The vastness of this subject makes it impossible to exhaust all its aspects within the compass of a paper like this. My chief intention here is rather to stress how by introducing several Nyāyas and Paribhāṣās Patañjali frees the interpretation of the Aṣṭādhyāyī from all its narrowness and liberalises and broad-bases it. Patañjali throws overboard a number of Vārttikas³³ *not by choice but from necessity*. Patañjali is not attempting any cheap heterodoxy. His rejection of the Vārttikas is incidental to the task he shoulders of widening the Pāṇinian interpretation, and is no part of any wanton rebellion against the achieved conclusions of the past.

Kātyāyana's differences with Pāṇini and Patañjali's differences with Kātyāyana are dictated by purely historical and academic reasons ; neither of them intends to carp at his predecessor or to indulge in craft-compliment.

There is an appearance of opposition between Kātyāyana and Patañjali ; but it is only an appearance and the opposition is nothing more than a difference. Both Kātyāyana and Patañjali attempt to span the gulf between themselves and their predecessors, but in two different ways. Unlike Patañjali Kātyāyana never tries to do more than to enable Pāṇini's work to cover the changes which took place in the language after Pāṇini's and before his own time ; Kātyāyana never attains Patañjali's width of gaze, never tries to make Pāṇini explain the possible changes in what must have been to him the future of the language. Kātyāyana's method is tentative and static ; in broadening the scope of the Aṣṭādhyāyī he emends and supplements it. Patañjali's way is more organic. An addition or an emendation is with him only a last resort. He has recourse to it only if after exploring all the aspects of Pāṇini's meaning, he has found that a certain change is not provided for in Pāṇini. Patañjali not only illumines the darkest corners of meaning in Pāṇini and exploits the

32. See the Mahābhāṣya on this Sūtra.

33. See my paper 'Kātyāyana', Poona Orientalist, Vol. V, Nos. 2 and 3, pp. 126 et seq.

possibilities of his work to the maximum extent, but confers an unassailable fixity on Pāṇini's authority by establishing his text under certain protective principles (mostly drawn from the text, i.e. the *Aṣṭādhyāyī* itself) which are so comprehensive as to make Pāṇini's work include in itself the explanations for the changes in the past, present and future of the language. Patañjali has made Pāṇini valid and active for all times and has put an irrevocable stop to the method of which Kātyāyana was very often guilty—of emending and supplementing interminably. The charge of unwarranted critical rancour against Kātyāyana has often been laid at Patañjali's doors. The justification for the rancour perhaps lies in the fact that it was dictated by an anxiety to make Pāṇini's text enlarged and safe. In all Sanskrit no author owes more to his commentator than Pāṇini does to Patañjali.

LOLIMBARĀJA AND HIS WORKS

By P. K. GODE

(continued from p. 333)

(3) RATNAKALĀ CARITRA

Only two MSS. of the *Ratnakalā Caritra* have been recorded by Aufrecht. The MS. in the India Office Library¹⁸ is described as “a dramatic poem of 84 verses (mainly Prākṛit) by Lolimbarāja.” This MS. is dated *Samvat* 1708 = A.D. 1651. The interlocutors in this dramatic poem are *Lolimmarāja*, *Ratnakalā* a *Sakhī*, a *budhī*(?), *Daū-lata* and *Ātmārāma*. Bühler records a Ms.¹⁹ of the *Ratnakalā Caritra* but he has included it in the works on Medicine.

18. Vide, p. 1491 of Vol. VII of *Ind. Office Mss. Catalogue* (1904) Ms. No. 2079c. Verse 1 at the beginning refers to the author :—

“जयति धरणिपीठे लाललोल्मिमराजः” ।

Verse 83 at the end also contains a reference to the poet :—

“लोल्मिमराजरचितैर्विविधैर्विचित्रैर्-
वैदग्ध्यवद्भिरहरलकलाचरित्रैः” ।

The specimens of the Prākṛit as recorded in the catalogue may be given here :—

“यडिघडिमुजपासों गोष्टिया (?) ची करावों
सकल्लभुवनभित्ती तो विचित्रि लिहावो (?) ।
बहु बहु उतकण्ठा जौउ जाइ लिजाणा
क्षणभरि तुम्हि आणा लाललोल्मिमराजः ॥२॥”

Last verse —“अतिरत्नकलाचरित्रजाले

सकलां हि कविच्या मनासि आले (?) ।

अमृताहुत गोडजाले

पठ्ठां वे पुठ्ठिसि (1) भक्तिभावैः ॥८४॥”

19. *Sanskrit Mss. from Gujrat etc.*, Fasc. IV, Bombay, 1873, p. 234. The MS. belonged to Nilakanṭha Raṇchoḍ of Ahmedabad.

As the poem appears to have been composed in Marāṭhī its author may have been a resident of Junnar. He may also be identical with the रत्नकलारमणकवि²⁰ referred to in the verses 96 and 97 which appear to me to be an interpolation substituted in the Harivilāsa in place of the verses giving the genealogy of the patron of the author with some particulars, which yet remain to be identified.

Lolimbarāja, the author of the *Ratnakalācaritra* referred to above appears to be identical with Lolimbarāja about whom the following particulars are recorded in Marāṭhī sources :—

In the History of Marāṭhī Literature called the *Mahārāṣṭra Sārasvata*²¹ by V. L. Bhave some account of poets of the “16th Century” is recorded. This account furnishes the following particulars about Lolimbarāja :—

Lolimbarāja is known as the author of a commentary in Marāṭhī on the 10th skandha of the *Bhāgavatapurāṇa*. He was a resident of Junnar.²² His surname was Joshi and his descendants are still living in Junnar province. He wrote a Sanskrit work on medicine called the *Vaidyajivana*. Many songs attributed to him are found in literature and in some old MSS. He was a well-known saint being included

20. The *Vaidyajivana* contains references to रत्नकला as follows :—

“अथले कृत कामबले चलदक् कमले कमलातनुरत्नकले” I. 74.

“अपि रत्नकले कलानिधे कुशले कोकिलकोमलखरे” I. 79.

“अयि रत्नकले नीलनलिनछन्दने क्षणे” III. 12.

“रत्नकला कृते मूलं गवाक्ष्याः etc. III. 43.

“अयि रत्नकले कुरमाकलहंसकलहंसकलत्रसमानगते” IV. 46.

The Commentator Harinātha (A.D. 1674) explains the name “रत्नकले” as रत्नजातिश्रेष्ठे” (fol. 30 of Ms. No. 913 of 1887-91). This explanation as also his explanation of सप्तशृङ्ग as हिमालय (fol. 4) is indicative of the fact that he (as early as A.D. 1674) was not aware of the biographical particulars about the Deccani Lolimbarāja. In verse 22 of *Vaidyajivana* a medical preparation is named after रत्नकला (“चूर्णं रत्नकलामिधं गुडपयोयुक्तं etc).

21. 2nd Edition, Poona, 1919; Published by B.I.S. Mandal, pp. 167 ff.

22. Raghunātha in his Commentary on the *Harivilāsa* calls लोलिम as resident Junnaar (“जुन्नरपत्तनाधिवसतिः लोलिम्बनामा कविः) ।

among the saints like उद्धवचिद्घन, रङ्गनाथ and शिवराम. Devadāsa²³ also refers to him. The account of his early life is very interesting. He was the son of Divākarabhaṭṭa.²⁴ In his younger days he was of a gay temperament and given to enjoyments. From a work called लोलिंबराजआख्यान it appears that he married a beautiful young Muhammedan girl whom he named रत्नकला²⁵. He was extremely attached to her. After her death his outlook on life changed. He then became a devotee of सतगुरुभवानी²⁶ and after some penance came to be

23. Bhavé quotes the following reference to Lolimbarāja in Devadāsa's work :—

“लोलिंबराजे करितांस्तवन । मस्तकीहून काढिलें जीवन ।
भक्तवत्सल तूं भग्नमान । महिमा कोण वणूं शके ॥”

Mr. Bhavé mentions two Marathi authors of the name देवदास, one of these two was the pupil of saint Rāmadāsa while the other was “चैतन्यशिष्य” (Mah. Sārasvata, p. 285).

24. In the Colophons of Mss. of *Vaidyājīvana* Lolimbarāja is called दिवाकरसूनु । This parentage is supported by the following verse towards the close of Vilāsa V of the *Vaidyājīvana* (Ms. No. 1093 of 1886-92, folio 33^a):—

“आयुचो देवचो विचारसमये धन्वन्तरिः केवलं
सीमा गानविदां दिवाकरसुधांबोधि त्रियामापतिः ‡
उक्तंसः कविताकृतां मतिमतां भूयुत्सभाभूषणं
कांतोकत्या कृत वैद्यजीवनमिदं लोलिम्भराजः कविः ॥२४॥”

The following editions of the *Vaidyājīvana* have been published :—(1) Bombay, 1874 ; (2) Edition with *Dīpikā* of Sukhānanda and *Bhāṣyanivṛtti* of Mihiracandra (Sanskrit and Hindi, Venkateshwar Press, Bombay 1920).

25. Mr. Bhavé quotes the following verses from लोलिंबराज आख्यान (p. 169)—

“ज्याची क्रीति जगत्रईं प्रगटली मन्दाकिनीचेपरी ।
जो एके घटिकेंत शंभर नवीं पद्ये विनोदे करी ॥
ज्याला ‘कविपातशाह’ पदवी विद्वज्जनी दीधली ।
तो हा रत्नकले । तुला विनवितो लोलिंबराजः कवी ॥”

26. Raghunātha in his Commentary on the *Harivilāsa* refers to this goddess

very much respected by the people. His work "Vaidyajīvana" was composed in Śaka 1555 (=A.D. 1633). — Mr. Bhavé then describes a MS. of *Vaidyajīvana* with him as follows :—

All the verses in this MS²⁷ are in Marāṭhī. The work is narrated to his beloved. The work ends with the line :— इति श्रीलोलिंबराजग्रन्थ वैद्यजावन संपूर्ण ।

One लयंबकराज²⁸ is often mentioned in this work. Can we surmise if लयंबक was the name of the author himself ?

Lolimbarāja is referred to by many authors.

(4) *Camatkāracintāmaṇi*

The Bikaner MS. of this work has been described by Rajendralal Mitra.²⁹ He describes it as a work "on practice of medicine. By Lolimbarāja, Son of Divākara Paṇḍita". The parentage of the author

and our author's devotion to her as follows :— 'सत्य (स) श्रद्धनिवासिनी भगवती लीलावतारोऽभवत्" (v. 4 at beginning of MS. No. 182 of 1902-07).

The *Vaidyajīvana* refers to सप्तश्रद्धा in verse 2 at the beginning as follows :—

“रत्नं वामदशां छायां सुखकरं श्री सप्तश्रद्धास्पदं

स्यष्टाष्टादशबाहुतेद्वगवतो भर्गस्य भाग्यं भजेत् ।

यद्वक्त्रेण मया घटस्तनि घटो मध्ये समुत्पाद्यते

पद्यान्तं शतमङ्गनाधरसुधास्पर्शाविधानोत्पुलकं ॥२॥”

Vide p. 433 of Pangarkar's *History of Marathi Literature*, II (1935).

सप्तश्रद्धा is situated to the north of Nasik. The image of the goddess at this place is 12 ft. high, with 18 arms.

27. So far we know only the Sanskrit work *Vaidyajīvana*. The Marāṭhī *Vaidyajīvana* referred to by Mr. Bhavé may be a Marāṭhī translation of the Sanskrit original by the author himself or by रघुनाथ the Commentator of the *Harivilāsa* who mentions त्र्यम्बकराज as his गुरु in this *Harivilāsaṭīkā* while Mr. Bhavé informs us that the Marāṭhī *Vaidyajīvana* contains numerous references to one त्र्यम्बकराज ।

28. Raghunātha in his Commentary on the *Harivilāsa* refers to one त्र्यम्बकराज as his guru (see MS. No. 182 of 1902-07).

29. Catal. of Bikaner MSS., Calcutta, 1880, p. 635.

given in the Colophon³⁰ of this MS. is identical with that given in the MS. of the *Vaidyājīvana*³¹. Burnell³² describes a MS. of the *Camatkāra-cintamani*, but he does not say anything about the authorship of the work, perhaps owing to the incomplete nature of the MS.

(5) *Vaidyāvataṃsa*

Burnell³³ describes a MS. of this work and states that it is a work by Lolimbarāja. He does not say anything about the parentage of this author.

The above work described by Burnell is identical with the work³⁴

30. This Colophon reads as follows :—

“इति श्रीमद्दिवाकरपण्डितसूनुलाललोलिम्बरजविरचिते चमत्कारचिन्तामणौ
नरप्रदिको नाम समाप्तः ॥”

The name “लाललोलिम्बरज” given in the above Colophon is exactly identical with “लाललोलिम्बरज” in the following line of the रत्नकलाचरित्र (I.O. MS.):—

“क्षणभरि तुम्हि आणा लाललोलिम्बरजः”

31. In verse 3 of *Vaidyājīvana*, Lolimbarāja refers to दिवाकर as follows :—

“दिवाकरप्रसादेन रोग्यारोग्यं समाहया ।

समासेन वयं कूर्म वाक्यं सद्धैद्यजीवनम् ॥३॥”

32. Tanjore MSS. Part I, London, 1879.—“a rather absurd work on the cure of diseases, beginning with fever and coughs by some pedant whose name is not given.” “Wants end ; recent.”

33. Ibid, p. 67^a—“*Vaidyāvataṃsa*, brief description of the properties of articles of food, commencing with fruits and ending with meats and preparations of milk by Lolimbarāja.” Begins :— “अनुकृतमरक्तवर्णा शोभितकर्णाकदम्बकुसुमेन..... कविकुलसुल्तानो लाललोलिम्बरजः” ।

“Recent. The abstract in red is mostly in Mahratta.”

According to लोलिम्बरज आख्यान referred to by Br. Bhavé Lolimbarāja was given the title कविपातशाह (ज्याला कविपातशाह पदवी विद्वज्जनी दीधली). Compare this statement with the above line from *Vaidyāvataṃsa* viz. “कविकुलसुल्तानो लाललोलिम्बरजः” ।

34. The MS. begins :—

“अथ वैद्यावतंस लिख्यते ।

अनुकृतमरक्तवर्णा शोभितकर्णा कदम्बकुसुमेन ।

नक्षत्रसुखरितवीणा मध्ये क्षीणा शिवाशिवं कुर्यात् ॥१॥

Vaidyāvataṃsa at the B. O. R. Institute, viz. No. 601 of 1899-1915. This MS. is dated Śaka 1724 = A.D. 1802. The work contains 155 stanzas in all, out of which 7 are devoted to the description and properties of the tobacco plant तमाखू. These stanzas bear numbers 56 to 62 and are followed by the statement that they have been taken from some other work³⁵.

The name of the work has, however, not been indicated in the MS. These verses appear to me to be an interpolation for the reason that the description of the तमाखू plant as found recorded in them pre-supposes the plantation³⁶ of tobacco in India about which no defi-

यत्प्रसिद्धमिह वर्तते फलं शाकमन्यदपि तन्निरूप्यते ।

अप्रसिद्धकथनं तु निष्फलं ग्रन्थविस्तरभयाच्च लिख्यते ॥२॥”

The MS. ends :—

“वाग्भटस्य मतमस्ति समस्तं

सुश्रुतस्य चरकस्य च किंचित् ।

तद्वदत्रितनयस्य विचित्रं

वाग्बिलासरचना मम तावत् ॥१५३॥

अधराङ्गिकृतबिंबा जितशशिबिंबा मुखप्रभया ।

गमनाविरलविलंबा विपुलनितंबा शिवाशिवं कुर्यात् ॥१५४॥

समस्तपृथ्वीपतिपूजनीयो । दिगंगनाच्छिद्यशःशरीरः ।

गुणिप्रियं ग्रन्थममुत्तमानं । लोलिंबराजः कविपातशाहः ॥१५५॥

शके १७२४ दुन्दुभी नाम संवत्सरे फाल्गुनशुद्धद्वादशं मन्दवासरे ग्रन्थसमाप्तिमगमत्” ।

35. Vide folio 7 of MS. No. 601 of 1899-1915—

“धूमाख्यो धूमवृक्षश्च.....श्लेषमाणं च विनश्यति ॥६२॥

इति तमाखूनाम गुणांश्च ग्रन्थातरात्संगृहीतं” ।

36. Vide article on tobacco in *Hobson-Jobson*, 1903, p. 925. *About A.D.* 1604-05.—“In Bijapur I had found some tobacco. Never having seen the like in India I brought some with me and prepared a handsome pipe of jewel work.His Majesty (Akbar) was enjoying himself after receiving my presentshis eye fell upon the tray with the pipe and its appurtenances : he expressed great surprise and examined the tobacco etc.” In the beginning the tobacco was imported into India and was considered an article of curiosity.

nite evidence for the period 1600 to 1625 A.D. or so has been available, though references to its importation into India have been recorded. Asād Beg (died 1626) on a mission from Akbar to Bijapur about A.D. 1603 saw tobacco for the first time. In A.D. 1617 Emperor Jahangir forbade its use as it had very bad effect on the health of many people. In 1660 Tavernier speaks of its growing in large quantities near Barhanpur.³⁷ The third MS. of the *Vaidyāvatamsa* as recorded in the Ujjain MSS³⁸ Catalogue is incomplete.

(6) *Vaidyājīvana*

I am not aware of the authority on which Mr. Bhavē³⁹ made his statement that the *Vaidyājīvana* was composed in A.D. 1633 (śaka 1555). Prof. Velankar states that Bühler⁴⁰ records a MS. of the *Vaidyājīvana* which is dated *Samvat* 1664 (=A.D. 1608). If this date of MS. is correct it conflicts with the above date of composition of the *Vaidyājīvana* given by Mr. Bhavē, viz. A.D. 1633⁴¹. Harinātha's commentary⁴² on the *Vaidyājīvana* was composed in *Samvat* 1730=A.D. 1674. We may, therefore, safely put about A.D. 1650 as one terminus to the date of Lolimbarāja.

Though MSS of all the commentaries on the *Vaidyājīvana* are not available to me for examination, I may record here the following dates gathered from the MSS of the work in the Govt. MSS Library at the B. O. R. Institute.

A gold tobacco-box was presented by the King of Siam in A.D. 1622 to Mr. Richard Fursland, "the President of the English nation" at Jaccatra (vide p. 297 of the *Journal of the Siam Society*, August, 1938).

37. Vide p. 165 of *Bombay Gazetteer* (Khandesh), Vol. XII.

38. *List of Ujjain MSS.*, 1936, p. 50.

39. *Mahārāṣṭra Sārasvata*, p. 170.

40. *Gujarat MSS.*, Fasc. IV, (1873) p. 241.

41. Cf. *Bodleian MSS. Cat.* by Winternitz and Keith, Vol. II, Oxford 1905, p. 112—MS. No. 1092 (1) of वैद्यजीवन, "The date is uncertain; A.D. 1633 according to Sinh Jee but a MS. of 1608 appears to exist, Jolly, *Medicin*, p. 2." The text of *Vaidyājīvana* with Harinātha's Commentary was printed at Benares in 1868.

42. See Velankar's *Cata. of BBRAS. MSS.*, Vol. I, 1925, p. 68—MS. No. 199.—The Chronogram for the date of composition of the Commentary is "विक्रमाब्दगणमाखंडितेन्दु" *Samvat* 1730. The MS. was copied at Akbarābād in *Samvat* 1884=A.D., 1828.

Manuscript	No.	Collection	Samvat	Śaka	A.D.
<i>Vaidyajīvana</i> (=V J)	374	1882-83	1848	1792
<i>VJ</i> with Comm. of Rudrabhaṭṭa	463	1895-98	1927	1871
<i>VJ</i> with Harinātha's Comm.	462	—Do—	1920	1864
—Do—	913	1887-91	1890	1755	1834
<i>VJ</i> with Rudrabhaṭṭa's Comm.	353	1879-80	1843	1787
<i>VJ</i> with Harinātha's Comm.	635	1895-1902	1868	1812
<i>VJ</i> with Rudrabhaṭṭa's Comm.	178	A 1882-83	1822	1687	1766

It will be seen from the above table that the oldest dated MS of the *VJ* at the B. O. R. Institute is dated A.D. 1766, but this date of MS. is of no use in our chronology of Lolimbarāja's works. In the *Catalogue of Ujjain MSS.* a MS⁴³ of the *VJ* with Rudrabhaṭṭa's Commentary dated Śaka 1728 (=A.D. 1806) has been recorded.

Kielhorn⁴⁴ records two dated MSS. of the *VJ*; one is dated Samvat 1810=A.D. 1754 while the other of the commentary of Jñānadeva or Dāmodara is dated Samvat 1669=A.D. 1613. If this date of a MS. of *VJ*, viz. A.D. 1613 is correct it supports the date A.D. 1608 of a MS. of the text of the *VJ*, recorded by Bühler. The cumulative effect of these two dates would enable us to push back the date of Lolimbarāja before A.D. 1600⁴⁵. This conclusion based on the actual dates of MSS. makes it impossible for me to believe in the accuracy of the statement of Mr. Pangarkar that Lolimbarāja flourished between A.D. 1578 and 1648.

The evidence recorded so far about Lolimbarāja's works leads me to divide it in two sections : (1) Evidence about Lolimbarāja, the author of the poem *Harivilāsa* and (2) Evidence about Lolimbarāja, the

43. *Cata. of Ujjain MSS.*, 1936, p. 50.

44. *C. P. MSS.*, Nagpur, 1874, p. 221—MS. No. 74 वैद्यजीवन स्तोत्रम्—Samvat 1810 and MS. 75—वैद्यजीवनटीका of Jñānadeva or Dāmodara—Samvat 1669.

45. Mr. Pangarkar (in his *History of Marathi Literature*, Vol. II, (1935) pp. 603-4) repeats the date of composition of *Vaidyajīvana* viz. Śaka 1555 (=A.D. 1633) given by Mr. Bhawe. He further states that Lolimbarāja's Chronology lies between Śaka 1500 and Śaka 1570 i.e. Between A.D. 1578 to 1648 a period of about 60 years. According to Mr. Pangarkar Ratnakalā was the daughter of the Yavana Subhedār of Junnar.

author of Vaidyajīvana and other works. The details of this evidence may be best represented as follows :—

Lolimbarāja I.

- (1) Author of *Harivilāsakāvya* (= *HK*).
- (2) Composed *HK* in A.D. 1583. The verse recording the Chronogram for this date is found in two MSS. of the *HK*, one of them being copied in A.D. 1622.
- (3) In the *HK* the author refers to him, only as 'लोलिबराज कविनायक' in the concluding verse of every *Sarga* in which he also states that he composed the poem *HK* by order of king हरि.
- (4) MSS. of *HK* are dated as follows :—
A.D. 1622—No. 204 of 1879-80
A.D. 1624—No. 78 of 1871-72.
- (5) Except the name Lolimbarāja the *HK* gives no information about the author. Verses 96 and 97 referring to the poet as रत्नकरारमण are spurious.
- (6) Verses 96 and 97 at the end of the printed edition of the *HK* are spurious as they are not found in any of the 8 MSS. of the *HK* examined by me. On the contrary the verses recording the genealogy of the patron of our author are supported by the following MSS. :—
(i) Ms. referred to in No. 468 of 1884-87.
(ii) No. 377 of 1884-87 which records the date of composition, viz. A.D. 1583.
(iii) MS. referred to by the Editor of the *Kāvyamālā* Edition of the *HK* in the footnote at the end of the poem.
(iv) Tanjore MS. No. 3858 contains the verse "श्रीमान् ल्हामरसो etc."

Lolimbarāja II.

- (1) Author of the following works :—
(i) *Vaidyajīvana*=*VJ*.
(ii) *Vaidyāvataṃsa*=*VT*.
(iii) *Camatkāracintāmaṇi*=*CC*
(iv) *Ratnakalācarita*=*RC* and other Marāṭhī works.
- (2) The following Chronology of the MSS. of this author is available :—
A.D. 1608—MS. of *VJ*.
A.D. 1613—MS. of *VJ*-Comm. of Dāmodara.
A.D. 1651—MS. of *RC* (IO. MS.)
A.D. 1674—Harinātha composed Comm. on *VJ*.
A.D. 1766—MS. of Rudrabhaṭṭa's Comm. on *VJ*.
- (3) The parentage of this author is given in the *CC*. as दिवाकरपण्डितसूनु (see Colophon) and in the *VJ* (in the text and in the Colophons).
- (4) No reference to the patron king is found in the works *VJ*, *VT*, *CC*, *RC*. This omission stands in vivid contrast with the name of king Hari referred to many times in the *HK* of Lolimbarāja I.
- (5) Ratnakalā, supposed to be the wife of this author is referred to in the *RC* which bears her name in the *VJ* in which she is addressed by name in some verses and in the Marāṭhī work लोलिबराज आख्यान, in which our author is called कविपातशाह.
In the *VT* the author calls himself कविकुलमुल्लतान as also कविपातशाह (v. 155).
- (6) The reference to the place सप्तशृङ्ग is found in verse 2 of *VJ* (this may be the सप्तशृङ्ग to the north of

(7) There is no evidence in the *HK* to prove that its author belonged to the Mahārāṣṭra. On the contrary, the patron king of this author hailed from a place called गयाचलगिरि. This king's genealogy is as follows :— हरि— ल्हामरस-रविपण्डित (m. येल्हांबिका) son हरि (patron of the author of the *HK*). This line belonged to मौनिभार्गवकुल which is called a द्विजकुल.

Nasik). This author belonged to the Mahārāṣṭra. The Commentator Harinātha (A.D. 1674) having no knowledge of the सप्तशृङ्ग hill near Nasik wrongly explains the expression “सप्तशृङ्गास्पदं” as “सप्त शृङ्गे हिमालये एव आस्पदं स्थानं यस्य तत्” (fol. 4 of MS. 913 of 1887-31). Rudrabhaṭṭa explains the expression as “सप्तशृङ्गाख्यः पर्वतः etc.” (fol. 3 of MS. No. 463 of 1895-98).

I hope the evidence recorded in this paper about Lolimbarāja and his works will enable scholars⁴⁶ to clarify some of the issues raised in this study but which still require more evidence to enable us to arrive at definite decisions. I have tried to put together whatever information I could get from the sources so far available to me with a view to help a more detailed examination of the several works of Lolimbarāja than what I have been able to carry out in the preparation of this tentative study.

46. Since this paper was drafted Dr. V. Raghavan of the Catalogus Catalogorum office, Madras University, has sent to me the information recorded by his office regarding Lolimbarāja and his works. Some of this information may be recorded here :—

- (1) Edition of *Harivilāsa-Kāvya* (Pandit II.)—Here the editor makes Lolimbarāja a contemporary of Bhoja.
- (2) There are numerous MSS. of the *Harivilāsa*, in none of which we find the chronogram (=A.D. 1583) found in the B.O.R. Institute—2 MSS.
- (3) In the *Vaidyājīvana* Lolimba describes himself as proficient in Vaidyaka, Kāvya and Music. No MS. of a music work of Lolimba has yet been found.
- (4) In the South Indian MSS. of the *Vaidyājīvana* (Trien. Cata. No. 2221, 2371, 2844 (a) the work is called “*Sadvaidyājīvana*.”
- (5) In Madras MS. No. 2371 referred to above the colophon says that Lolimba was the son of king of Muñja of Vidarbha.
- (6) Rudrabhaṭṭa, the Commentator on the *Vaidyājīvana*, was the son of Koneribhaṭṭa, who was doctor to one *Khān Khān* and Rudra himself wrote under *Mirkhān*. If the identity of these two *Khānas* is proved we may have some external datum for Lolimba's date limits.—I am thankful to Dr. Raghavan for the information sent by him.

KANIŠKA'S ERA

By PRABODH CHANDRA SENGUPTA

The eras used in the Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions are still a matter for controversy. Dr. Sten Konow in his celebrated edition of them in the *Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum*, Vol. II. pp. lxxxii—lxxxiii, has collected together 36 instances of dates from these inscriptions and has divided them into two groups, A and B. The dates used in group A belong to an earlier era, while those in group B use the era or the regnal years of Kaniška. In this note we propose to ascertain the era used in this second group B. Of the dates in this latter group only those which are found in nos. 26 and 35 give us some clue as to the era used, viz.,

26.Zeda : Sam 11 Āṣādhāsa masasa di 20 Uttaraphagune isakṣunamī marodasa marjhakasa Kaniṣkhasa rajami.

35.Und : Sam 61 Cetrāsa mahasa divase athami di 8 iṣe kṣunamī Pūrvāṣādhē.

These instances state that in the eleventh year of King Kaniška on the 20th day of lunar Āṣādhā, the moon was conjoined with the nakṣatra *Uttaraphalgunī*, and that in the year 61 of Kaniška, the moon's nakṣatra was *Pūrvāṣādhā*, on the 8th day of *Caitra*. From some examples of date in the Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions Dr. Konow has come to the conclusion that "the full-moon day must be the first day of the month," the chief example being that the first day of Vaiśākha was taken as the full-moon day of Vaiśākha (*Saṁvatsare tiṣatīme 103 Veśākhasa divase prathamime di atra puṇapakṣe*—no. 10, group A of Konow's list). Here there is no room for a difference of opinion with Dr. Konow. But I have to say that this system of reckoning the full-moon ending lunar months is not Indian, it may be Greek or it may be Babylonian. The month that is called Vaiśākha in this inscription would be called the full-moon ending lunar *Jyaiṣṭha* according to the Indian reckoning. In the *Mahābhārata* also we have, "the full-moon near the Maghās is about to come and the month of *Māgha* is also drawing to its close."

Now accepting the reckoning of the full-moon ending months as stated in the inscriptions, the meaning is clear that the day that

is spoken of as the 20th of Āṣāḍha is the 5th day of new-moon ending Śrāvaṇa, and the 8th day of Caitra is the 8th day of the dark half of Caitra. Hence we have the dates as :—

- (i) Year 11, month Śrāvaṇa, 5th day, *Uttaraphalgunī*.
- (ii) Year 61, month Caitra, 23rd day, *Pūrvāṣāḍhā*.

Dr. Fleet is of opinion that the well-known Śaka era and the Kaṇiṣka era, are but one and the same era. Now the years 11 and 61 of the Śaka era are similar to the years 1925 and 1937 A.D. of our times in respect of luni-solar-stellar aspects, and —

(a) In 1925 A.D. on July 26, the moon's nakṣatra was Uttara-phalgunī.

(b) In 1937 A.D. on April 4, the moon's nakṣatra was Pūrvāṣāḍhā.

But the 4th April, 1937 A.D. is shown in modern Hindu Calendars as the 8th day of the dark half of Phālguna. It may be observed, however, that the Vedic standard month of Māgha, came in the year 1935 from February 3 to March 5, and that no intercalary month would be reckoned in those days of pre-scientific Hindu astronomy within the next $2\frac{1}{2}$ years from February 3, 1935, as was done in the present day Hindu calendars from September 16 to October 15, in the year 1936 A.D. Hence the lunar month that was called lunar Phālguna in the modern calendar for 1937, was called the month of *Caitra* according to this old reckoning. Hence from a purely astronomical standpoint, Kaṇiṣka's era and the well-known Śaka era may be identified with each other. But this Śaka era started from 78 A.D. is perhaps to be associated with the death of a Śaka King as Brahmagupta says—“कलेर्गौरीकगुणाः (३१७६) शकान्तेऽब्दाः”² “The Kali years were 3179 (elapsed) at the death of the Śaka King.” Again Brahmagupta calls the years of the Śaka era as “the years of the Śaka Kings” (शक-नृपाणाम् पञ्चाशत् संयुक्तैर्वर्षशतैः पञ्चभिरतीतैः³ i.e., when 550 years of the Śaka Kings had elapsed). Hence the regnal years of King Kaṇiṣka may not be the same as the years of the Śaka era as used by the Hindu astronomers. It seems likely that the Śaka era was started with the death of the predecessor of Kaṇiṣka whose real accession to the throne came in the year 78 A.D., while his regnal years were reckoned from the year of his coronation. On this hypothesis Kaṇiṣka's regnal years or his era was started at a very short interval from 78 A.D.

2. B. Sphuṭasiddhānta, i, 26,

3. *Ibid.*, xxiv, 7.

In the *Paitāmaha Siddhānta* as summarised by Varāhamihira in his *Pañcasiddhāntikā*, the epoch used is the year 2 of the Śaka Kings :—

इयूनं शकेन्द्रकालं पञ्चभिरुद्धृत्य शेषवर्षाणाम् ।

द्यु गणं माघसिताद्यं कुर्यात् तदहन्युदयात् ॥⁴

“Deduct 2 from the year of the Śaka Kings, divide the result by 5 : of the remaining years find the *ahargana* from the beginning of the light half of Māgha starting from the sunrise of that day.”

We can now readily show that we may take the regnal years of Kaniska to have been started from this year 2 of the Śaka Kings.

On this hypothesis, we have,

the year 2 of Śaka Kings=80 A.D.,

∴ the year 11 of Kaniska=91 A.D.

The year 91 A.D. is similar to the 1927 A.D. of our time ; for the no. of years elapsed=1836 and $1836=160 \times 11 + 19 \times 4$. Hence the 20th day of *Āṣāḍha* of the inscription is similar to Tuesday, the 2nd. August, 1927 A.D.

Again the year 61 of Kaniska=141 A.D. and the year in our time similar to 141 A.D. is readily seen to be 1939 A.D., and that the date of the inscription corresponds to Tuesday, the 11th April, 1939 A.D.

Now the interval between 1939 A.D. and 1927 A.D. = 12 years, whereas between the year 11 and the year 61 of Kaniska the interval is 50 years. Now as $50=19 \times 2 + 12$, the moon's phases near to the fixed stars which repeat in 50 years also do repeat in 12 years. It is quite consistent to take King Kaniska's regnal years to have been reckoned from the year 2 of the Śaka Kings.

It now remains (i) to determine how and when the year of the Śaka Kings was taken to begin initially, (ii) why the lunar months were reckoned from the full-moon day itself and (iii) to verify by back calculation, the dates mentioned of the years 11 and 61 of Kaniska.

With regard to the first point, we know that in Vedic times the year was taken to begin from the winter solstice day or from the day following ; in the Vedāṅga period also, the year was begun from the winter solstice day. As the time when the Śaka era came to be reckoned was before that of Āryabhaṭa I (499 A.D.), we may reasonably assume that originally the Śaka year also was begun from the winter solstice day.

We assume further that the winter solstice day was correctly determined 5 years before the Śaka year 2 or 80 A.D. The number of

tropical years between 75 A.D. and 1900 A.D.=1825, which comprise 666576 days nearly. On applying these days backward to Dec. 22, 1899 A.D., we arrive at the date Dec. 24, 74 A.D., on which at G. M. Noon—

Mean Sun= $270^{\circ} 56' 21'' \cdot 11$

„ Moon= $121 \ 15 \ 31 \cdot 75$

Lunar Perigee= $231 \ 39 \ 49 \cdot 94$

Sun's Apogee= $69 \ 58 \ 35 \cdot 32$

Sun's Eccentricity= $0 \cdot 01747191$

Hence on Dec. 22, 74 A.D.

at G. M. N.

Mean Sun= $268^{\circ} 58' 4'' \cdot 45$

Mean Moon= $94 \ 54 \ 21 \cdot 69$

L. Perigee= $231 \ 26 \ 27 \cdot 83$

Appt. Sun= $269^{\circ} 38'$

Appt. Moon= $91^{\circ} 44'$ nearly

Thus on Dec. 22, 74 A.D., the full-moon happened about 4 hours before G. M. N., and the sun reached the winter solstice in about 7 hrs.

This elucidates the points (i) & (ii) viz. that the Śaka year was initially taken to begin from the winter solstice day and why the months were reckoned from the full-moon day itself. In 75 A.D. the mean longitude of *Pollux* was $86^{\circ} 31'$ nearly; the moon at opposition on Dec. 22nd, 74 A.D., had the longitude at about $89^{\circ} 28'$, i.e. about 3° ahead of the star *Pollux*, and the day was that of the full-moon of Pausa, and similar in our times to that which happened on Jan. 15, 1930.

The actual starting of the era of Kaṇiṣka may have taken place on our hypothesis from the full-moon day of Dec. 26 of 79 A.D. as the first day of lunar Pausa. This agrees with the statement of the inscription that the Vaiśākha māsa had the first day on the day of the full-moon near the *Viśākhās*.

Having thus shown why the era of Kaṇiṣka may be taken to have been started from the 26th December, 79 A.D., we now turn to determine the date for *Sam* 11, Āṣāḍha māsa, di 20, Uttaraphalgunī. Evidently the date was similar to Aug 2, 1927 A.D., and between these years the interval was 1836 years, which comprise 670611 days nearly. We apply these days backward to Aug. 2, 1927 A.D. and arrive at the date July 8, 91 A.D. and on July 8, 91 A.D. at G.M.N.

Mean Sun= $104^{\circ} 14' 50'' \cdot 20$,

Mean Moon= $146^{\circ} 41' 3 \cdot 00$,

Lunar Perigee= $184^{\circ} 37' 5 \cdot 67$,

Sun's Apogee= $70^{\circ} 15' 34 \cdot 87$,

Sun's Eccentricity= $0 \cdot 017466$.

Hence—

Appt. Sun= $103^{\circ} 7'$

Appt. Moon= $142^{\circ} 36'$

and the "junction star" U. Phalgunī= $144^{\circ} 46'$

Again 19 days before this date, i.e. on June 19, 91 A.D. at G. M. N.—

Mean Sun= $85^{\circ}31'11''\cdot93$	Hence
Mean Moon= $256^{\circ}19'54''\cdot53$	Apparent Sun= $85^{\circ}0'$
Lunar Perigee= $182^{\circ}30'5''\cdot64$	Apparent Moon= $261^{\circ}12'$

Thus the full-moon happened about 8 hrs. later, and this was the first day of the month. Hence the 8th of July, 91 A.D. was the 20th day of Āṣāḍha, and it has been made clear that the moon on this day got conjoined with β Leonis or *uttaraphalguni* in the evening. *The date of the inscriptions was thus July 8, 91 A.D.*

Next as to the year 61 of Kaṇiṣka=Śaka year 63=141 A.D., the moon on the 8th day of the dark half of Caitra was conjoined with the *nakṣatra Pūrvaṣāḍhā*. The day in question was similar to April 11, 1939 A.D. of our time. The number of years between 141 A.D. and 1939 A.D. was 1798, and in 1798 sidereal years there are 656731 days. These days applied backward to April 11, 1939 A.D. lead us to the date :—

March 17, 141 A.D., on which at G. M. N.,

Mean Sun= $353^{\circ}44'43''\cdot00$	Hence—
Mean Moon= $258^{\circ}15'1''\cdot12$	Appt Sun= $355^{\circ}41'$
Lunar Perigee= $46^{\circ}46'56''\cdot97$	Appt Moon= $254^{\circ}14$ and
Sun's Apogee= $71^{\circ}6'27''\cdot69$	P. Āṣāḍha= $248^{\circ}43'$
Sun's Eccentricity= $\cdot017447$	(δ Sagittarii)

Here the conjunction of the moon with δ *Sagittarii* on this day was estimated in the previous night. The day in question was of the 7th *tithi* according to the *siddhāntas* and the day of the last quarter was the day following ; but this day was the 8th day of the month. For on the 10th March, 141 A.D. at G. M. N. ;

Mean Sun= $346^{\circ}50'44''\cdot70$	Hence the full-moon had
Mean Moon= $166^{\circ}0'55''\cdot92$	happened about 3 hrs. earlier.
Lunar Perigee= $46^{\circ}0'9''\cdot50$	

This was the full-moon day and the 1st day of Caitra ; hence the 17th March was the 8th day of the month.

Thus we see that the hypothesis that the era of King Kaṇiṣka was started from December 25 of 79 A.D. or from the year 2 of the Śaka era satisfies all the conditions that arise from the dates given in

the Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions, group B of Dr. Konow. The present investigation shows that the Śaka emperor Kaṇiṣka lived at the beginning of the Śaka era, a view which I hope, would be endorsed by all right minded historians and it would not go against Dr. Fleet. When this solution of the problem is possible we need not try to find others leading to other dates for the beginning of Kaṇiṣka's regnal years.

Dr. Van Wijk, the astronomical assistant to Dr. Konow, has tried to show that the era of Kaṇiṣka was started from 128 A.D. and would identify the regnal year 11 of Kaṇiṣka with 139 A.D.

He based his calculation on the modern *Sūryasiddhānta*, which cannot be dated earlier than 499 A.D. Without examining his calculations we can say that his findings are vitiated for the following reasons :-

(a) The *Caitraśuklādi* reckoning of the year as found in the modern *Sūryasiddhānta* cannot be applicable to the early years of Śaka era and Kaṇiṣka's regnal years which were prior to 499 A.D.

(b) The word "day of the month" means simply a day and is not to be confounded with a *tithi* as used in the modern *Sūryasiddhānta*.

(c) The word "nakṣatra" mentioned in these inscriptions meant very probably "star clusters" and not 27th part of the ecliptic.

(d) He has further used the *Indian* full-moon ending months and not the full-moon ending months as used in the Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions. His identifying the year 11 of Kaṇiṣka with 139 A.D. would thus make the 20th day of Āṣāḍha correspond with July 18, 1942 of our own time—the day of the 5th *tithi* of the new-moon ending lunar Āṣāḍha.

For these reasons I have used the most accurate and up-to-date equations for finding the Sun and moon's mean elements instead of following the *Sūryasiddhānta*. The luni-solar periods used in this investigation are also most accurate and deduced from the constants as given by Newcomb and Brown. It has been shown that the days of the months are also "days" and not *tithis* and *nakṣatras* mean "star-clusters" and not equal divisions of the ecliptic. I have taken the data from the inscriptions as actually observed astronomical events.

LATIN AND SANSKRIT*

By BATAKRISHNA GHOSH

Of all the Indo-European languages of Europe Latin is most like Sanskrit, —both in internal structure and in external history. Both of them are synthetic *par excellence*, and have retained in this respect one of the most prominent characteristics of the original Indo-European which the other dialects have gradually given up. In Latin too, as in Sanskrit, thought appears in a condensed form which the man spoken to must analyse in mind ; cf. *regebamus* “we were ruling”, *monebar* “I was being advised”, etc. Latin sentences too are crisp and curt ; cf. *factum, non fabula* “fact, not fable”, *oderint dum metuant* “they may hate me if they would only fear me”, etc. Caesar’s “*veni, vidi, vici*”, though affected no doubt, was altogether in conformity with the spirit of the Latin language.

Like Sanskrit, Latin has been the cultural language of a continent for nearly two thousand years, and of all the other Indo-European languages only Latin can be compared with Sanskrit in the number of derived daughter dialects. Italian, French, Spanish, Portuguese and Roumanian are the five modern European literary languages directly derived from vulgar forms of Latin, and but for the repeated invasions of England by the Germanic tribes English too would have been to-day a Romance language like French or Italian.

The literature of this language, from which so many literary languages are derived, consisted however at the beginning only of translations and adaptations of Greek works. The first poet who wrote in Latin was the Greek Livius Andronicus (literary activity from 240 to 207 B.C.), and Plautus (died about 184 B.C.), the chief Latin pre-classical poet who wrote in what is supposed to have been the spoken dialect of the common people of Rome, calls himself both a poet and a translator. Terence, a younger contemporary of Plautus, wrote six comedies which are chaster and more truly Attic than the dramas of Plautus. The victory of Greek influence upon Latin literature was assured for all time to come through the labours of Ennius (in Rome from 204 to 169 B.C.), who initiated the sons of the Roman patricians to the higher poetry and literature of Greece, and he it was who gave the Romans the hexameter. It was Ennius

*Students who might care to read this paper are expected to have first read my “Linguistic Introduction to Sanskrit” (LIS.).

again, more a Greek in spirit than a Roman, who wrote the first prose work in Latin.

Thus under the guidance of Greek tutors Latin literature began to grow, and under the protecting wings of the Roman eagle it blossomed and flowered all over the Roman empire. The empire went to pieces in the fifth century, but the literature with its vehicle the Latin language continued to be a world power for a thousand years longer. Like classical Sanskrit in India, Latin in Europe in the Dark and Middle Ages was the only language of international civilisation and culture. But it more and more identified itself with the Christian Church, and therefore was frowned upon by the leaders of the pagan renaissance. Liberal minds in Europe learned to hate it when the Church began its policy of religious persecution, and it was finally superseded by modern European languages after the great French Revolution which divorced religion from culture.

Judged by the highest standards of human civilisation, the Romans, excepting in architecture, cannot be said to have been great creators of values. But they taught the world how to retain and turn to account the values created and frittered away by the restless Greeks. The Romans did not discover independently any great system of philosophy that may be said to have become part of the common heritage of human civilisation. But to a large portion of Europe they gave centuries of peace. Thus they unconsciously taught mankind a lesson which we have not yet been able to assimilate,—that peace is desirable and that it is possible to organise peace. Roman imperialism however has been eagerly imitated with varying success by every European power to the present day. In the field of ethics an inordinate veneration for law was the chief characteristic of the Romans of the best type imbued with the teachings of Stoic philosophers. And it is not without reason that Roman law has been accepted as the basis of jurisprudence in all the European countries. But this can be hardly called lucky, for the Romans mistook order for justice; just as in art they mistook symmetry for beauty. It is ancient Rome at work when in India, for instance, we hear to-day so often of law and order but never of law and justice.

Latin is only one of the various Indo-European and non-Indo-European languages of ancient Italy, and it is due to political accidents and nothing more that Latin has triumphed over all of them. To understand the position of Latin, therefore, it is necessary to take account of these other languages. Moreover, as Latin and the other ancient Indo-European dialects of Italy share with the Celtic languages a number of striking linguistic innovations (see LIS., p. 26) the history of Latin should begin really with the hypothetical age of Italo-

Celtic unity. But of this age we know nothing. We shall have to content ourselves therefore with noting down the linguistic innovations common to Italic and Celtic.—For the earliest period of Latin our chief source is the inscriptions, but they are neither so abundant nor so old as the dialectal inscriptions of Greece. Latin literature too is late compared with that of Greece, Iran and India. Inscriptions in other dialects of Italy are still later if Etruscan is left out of consideration. The Etruscan inscriptions however, of which there are thousands, may be very old, but they have not yet been deciphered.

The ancient Indo-European dialects of Italy fall into two groups, namely Latin-Faliscian and Oscan-Umbrian. The former comprises Latin with its local variations in the different towns of Latium and Faliscian spoken in the south-eastern part of Etruria. Faliscian inscriptions clearly prove that it differed but slightly from Latin. The Oscan-Umbrian group is so named from its two most important dialects, but it includes also the dialects of the minor tribes of central Italy which are sometimes called Sabellian. Of the Sabellian dialects Paelignian closely resembles Oscan, but Volscian (known only from one inscription of four lines) resembles Umbrian more than Oscan.

Oscan was by no means a mere local patois : Ennius boasted of having three souls because he could speak Greek, Oscan and Latin. That it was the language of the Samnites is clear from the indications of Latin authors. Livy, for instance, says that during one of the Samnite wars the Roman consul sent out spies who knew the Oscan language. It would seem that the Oscans were a branch of the Samnites speaking essentially the same language. There are over two hundred Oscan inscriptions.—Umbrian is known chiefly from the Iguvinian Tables (first century B. C.) containing between four and five thousand words.

Regarded from the view-point of Italic vocalism Umbrian and Oscan may be said to represent the two extremes with Latin in the centre. Oscan has retained the Indo-European diphthongs with a fidelity rivalled only by Greek, but Umbrian has gone further even than Latin in levelling them down. In other respects however Oscan-Umbrian is sharply distinguished from Latin-Faliscian. Indo-European labio-velars, for example, appear as labials in Oscan-Umbrian, but in Latin-Faliscian as *qu* (*g*)*u*. Thus Lat. *quod* : O. *pūd* : U. *pūr-e* (in Umbrian intervocalic *d* became *r̃*, pronounced *rs*); Lat. *quid* : O. *pīd* : U. *pīr̃-e*; Lat. *quanta* : U. *pantan*.—I.-E. *g^w* appears in Latin as *v* or (after *n*) *gu*, but in Oscan-Umbrian as *b*. Thus Lat. *veniō* : O. *kūm-bened* : U. *benust* : I.-E. **g^wem-* : Skt. *gam-*; Lat. *vīvus* : O. *bivus* : I.-E. **g^weḷəyos* : Skt. *jīvaḥ* ; Lat. *unguēn* : U. *umen* < **omben* : I.-E. **an̥g^w-* : Skt. *anākti*. Lat. *bōs* (< I.-E. **g^wōus-* : Skt. *gauḥ*) is clearly a loan-word from some Oscan-Umbrian dialect.—I.-E. *g* *h* has developed into various sounds in Latin (see below), but in

Oscan-Umbrian we find only *f* corresponding to it; thus from I.-E. **ek^heg^h* h- we have Umbrian *vufetes*: Lat. *voveō*: Gr. *eúkhomai*: Skt. *vāghát*.

The chief distinguishing feature of Oscan-Umbrian is doubtless this labialisation of Indo-European labio-velars, but these dialects differ from Latin also on many other points which it is necessary to briefly consider in this connection:—¹

1. Extensive syncope of short vowels in non-initial syllables; thus O. *húrz*: Lat. *hortus*, U. *Ikuvíns*: Lat. *Iguvinus*, etc.

2. Assimilation of *nd* to *nn*; thus O. *úpsannam*: Lat. *operandam*, U. *pihaner* (for **pihanner*): Lat. *piandi*.

3. Retention of *s* before nasals and liquids, where it is lost in Latin. Thus O. *físnam*: Lat. *fanum*, O. *kersnu*: U. *sesna*: Lat. *cena*.

4. Retention of *a* in medial syllables, where it is weakened to *e* or *i* in Latin. Thus O. *Anterstatai*: Lat. **Interstitae*; U. *antakres*: Lat. *integris*.

5. Representation of original *bh* and *dh* by *f*, not only initially as in Latin, but also medially, where Latin has *b* or *d*. Thus O. *tfei*: U. *tefe*: Lat. *tibi*; O. *mefiú*: Lat. *media*: Skt. *mádhyā*; U. *rufri*: Lat. *rubros*: Skt. *rudhíra*.

6. Change of final *ā*, which in Latin is shortened, in the direction of *ō*. Thus O. *molto*: U. *mutu muta*: Lat. *multa*.

7. Change of *kt* to *ht*, and of *pt* to *ft* (which in Umbrian further changes to *ht*). Thus O. *úhtavis*: Lat. *octavius*, U. *rehte*: Lat. *recte*, O. *scritas*: U. *screhto*: Lat. *script-*.

8. Change of *ns* to *f*, though under different conditions, in Oscan and Umbrian. Thus O. *úittiuf* < **oitíōns*: Lat. *usus*; U. acc. pl. *eaf* < **eans*: Lat. *eas* (but O. *viass*).

9. In nominal flexion Oscan-Umbrian is more conservative than Latin. In the first declension (*ā*-stems) the gen. sg. has the ending *-ās*, which can be seen in Latin only in frozen phrases like *pater familiās*; the nom. pl. of *ā*-stems shows the historical ending *-ās* in Oscan-Umbrian, but in Latin the corresponding ending *-ae* is an innovation. In the second declension (*o*-stems) the gen. sg. of Oscan-Umbrian has borrowed the ending *-eis* from *i*-stems, but in Latin we find the ending *-ī*; the dat. sg. has the ending *-oi* which can be perceived in Latin only in the word *Numasioi* occurring in the oldest extant Latin inscription of the Praenestine brooch (600 B.C.); the nom. pl. has in Oscan-Umbrian the original noun-ending *-os* for both nouns and pronouns, while Latin has *-ī* (< *-oi*) which is the pronominal ending; the gen. pl. has in Oscan-

1. See Buck, *A Grammar of Oscan and Umbrian*, pp. 7ff.

Umbrian the original ending *-om* (Lat. *-um*) in place of Lat. *-ōrum* which is borrowed from pronominal flexion. In the third declension the nom. pl. of consonant-stems and *i*-stems are kept distinct in Oscan-Umbrian, but not in Latin.

10. Differences in verbal system are numerous and striking. Oscan-Umbrian pres. infin. act. ends in *-om*, but that of Latin in *-se*; thus O. *ezum* : U. *erom* : Lat. *esse*. The characteristic Oscan-Umbrian *f*-perfect is lacking in Latin, while the Latin *vī*- and *s*-perfects are lacking in Oscan-Umbrian. In the third person sing. and third person pl. there is in Oscan-Umbrian a difference between primary endings (*-t*, *-nt*) and secondary endings (*-d̄*, *ns*); Latin shows *-d* in some of the earliest inscriptions, but nothing corresponding to *-ns*. The third person sing. and pl. of the passive have in Oscan-Umbrian the endings *-ter* and *-r* which are unknown in Latin (cf. O. *vincter* but Lat. *vincitur*, U. *ferar* but Lat. *feratur*).

Oscan and Umbrian have agreed to differ from Latin on these and other points, but there are points on which they do not agree among themselves. Original diphthongs are preserved intact in all positions in Oscan, but in Umbrian they are monophthongised in all positions. Thus Lat. *aut* : O. *aut* : U. *ote*; Lat. *prae* : O. *prai* : U. *pre*; the dat.-abl. pl. ending *-ois* is retained in its original form in Oscan, but it is *-es* in Umbrian and *-is* in Latin. Intervocalic *s* is sonorised in Oscan, but in Latin and Umbrian it changes further into *r* (rhotacism!); thus the genitive plural ending of *ā*-stems is *-ārum* in Latin and Umbrian, but *-azum* in Oscan (both from I.-E. **-āsōm*. Before palatal vowels, *k* is assimilated in Umbrian (so also in late Latin) but not in Oscan; thus U. *façia* : O. *fakiia* : Lat. *faciat*. Gutturals are liquefied into *i* before *t* in Umbrian; thus U. *aitu* : O. *actud* : Lat. *agitō*. The change of intervocalic *d* to *rs* (*r* in Umbrian alphabet) is another distinguishing feature of Umbrian; thus U. *peri* : Lat. *pede*. Even more remarkable is the change in Umbrian of original final *-ns* to *-f*, for which Oscan has *-ss*; thus U. *eaf* (<**eans*> Lat. *eas*) but O. *viass* (<**vians*> Lat. *vias*). Most important of all, Umbrian alone of the Italic dialects has retained the I.-E. pronominal formans *-sm-*; thus U. *pūsme esmei* corresponding to Skt. *kāsmāi āsmāi*.

It will be clear from the foregoing that "the differences between Oscan-Umbrian and Latin are considerable. They are far greater, for example, than those between the Greek dialects."² And moreover, these differences are of pre-Italic-Italo-Celtic-antiquity. We know that Italic and Celtic are a pair of twins among the Indo-European family of dialects, characterised by a number

of common linguistic innovations (LIS., p. 26). What is however quite astonishing in this connection is the fact that these innovations are distributed among the Italic dialects in the same manner as among the Celtic dialects,⁸—to the result that some peculiarities of Latin, though unknown in Oscan-Umbrian, may be discovered in one group of Celtic languages, while some peculiarities of Oscan-Umbrian, though unknown in Latin, may be the distinguishing feature of another Celtic group. It would thus seem that the specific characterisation of Latin and Oscan-Umbrian had taken place, in part at least, already in the Italo-Celtic period, long before any Italic speech was spoken in Italy. Let us consider here some of these strangely distributed Italo-Celtic innovations.

In the use of medial and passive verbal forms in *-r* Latin goes with Gaelic in so far as only these two languages share the deponential flexion in *-r*; thus Lat. *sequor*: O. Ir. *sechur*, Lat. *sequimur*: O. Ir. *sechimmir*, Lat. *sequuntur*: O. Ir. *sechitir*, etc. On the other hand only Oscan-Umbrian and Britannic know the passivic third person singular in bare *-r* without the preceding *-t*; thus U. *ferar* (against Lat. *feratur*) and O. *sakrafir* are paralleled by Cymric *celir*, etc. The *b*-future is shared in common by Latin and Irish, while in Oscan-Umbrian we find an *s*-future; in Britannic the present is used in future sense. The syllabic nasal appears in Latin and Irish before consonants as *en*; thus Lat. *centum*: Ir. *cēt* (< **cent*: I.-E. **k̑mtóm*); in Oscan-Umbrian and Britannic however it has developed into *an* in initial position (cf. on the one hand U. *antakres*=Lat. *integris* O. *amprufid*=Lat. *improbe*, and on the other the Cymric prohibitive particle *an*-<I.-E. **h̑*-). The disagreement between Latin and Oscan-Umbrian observed in the treatment of Indo-European labio-velars (see above) is paralleled by similar disagreement among the Celtic dialects; just as Lat. *qu* appears as *p* in Oscan-Umbrian, so does Gaelic *q* (later *c*) appear as *p* in Britannic; thus O. Ir. *maqqi* (later *maci*): Cym. *map*.

How these differences and agreements—both equally striking—between Italic and Celtic are to be explained we do not know. It seems as though Latin and Gaelic had somehow got mixed up even before primitive Italic and primitive Celtic were characterised as homogeneous groups! Regarding Oscan-Umbrian and Britannic however it is necessary to remember that though their relation is as intimate as can be, yet common linguistic innovations in the strictest sense are wanting. It has to be assumed at any rate, that primi-

8. Celtic dialectology will be fully discussed in the chapter on Celtic languages. For our present purpose it will be sufficient to note that apart from Gallic they are divided into two groups, viz. (1) Britannic consisting of Cymric (Welsh), Cornish, and Breton (Armorican), and (2) Gaelic consisting of Irish Gaelic, Scotch Gaelic, and Manx. . . .

tive Latin and primitive Oscan-Umbrian had been distinctly characterised even before the speakers of these hypothetical dialects reached Italy.

Before we begin our analysis of the Latin language it will be necessary to consider yet another factor of vital importance without which the Latin language and Roman civilisation would have been much different from what they have been. It is the influence of the non-Indo-European Etruscan language.⁴ To survive—let us hope, as the fittest—Latin had to destroy not only her compeers, the other Indo-European dialects of Italy such as Oscan and Umbrian, but also Etruscan, which was the language of the highly developed pre-Indo-European civilisation of Italy. There are thousands of Etruscan inscriptions, but instead of decipherment we have as yet mostly very learned hypotheses. But an Etruscan period of Italian history, just at the threshold of the historical period, is now accepted by all authorities. Roman history begins in fact with the Etruscans settled between the Po and the Tiber and the Greeks in the south. Cramped between these two civilised peoples the rude Latins must have at first led a miserable life in the middle. But their opportunity came when the Etruscans were crushed by the intruding Celtic hordes, who in 390 B.C. under Brennus were within an ace of capturing Rome. Being a commercial people the Etruscans could not offer any stout resistance to the Celts or the Romans. Modern research on the whole supports the tradition recorded by Herodotos that this mysterious people was originally at home in Asia Minor. Kretschmer, for instance, has accepted the identity of the Etruscans with the Tyrrhenians well known in ancient history. According to this authority,⁵ the form *Tursāno-* (> *Tyrrhēno-*) was changed to *Tursco* by the Umbrians in whose language the suffix *-co* was very productive, and this *Tursco* further became *Tuscom* (modern *Tuscany*).

The Etruscans were to the Latins what the Pelasgoi were to the Greeks, and it has been suggested that the Pelasgoi and the Etruscans might have been the same people. Even granting the impossibility of proving the identity of two unknown entities, it remains nevertheless a striking fact that words marked by the sound-group *-nth*, which was certainly a distinguishing feature of the place-names of Asia-Minor, did occur both in Pelasgian and Etruscan. The god of Love engraved on an Etruscan mirror bears the inscription *aminth*. This proves incidentally that Lat. *amo* "I love", for which no satisfactory parallel can be found in any Indo-European language, was a word borrowed from the Etruscans. So was Lat. *pulcher* "beautiful", of which the unusual aspiration

4. The present stand of Etruscology has been described by Eva Fiesel, "Die Forschung der indogermanischen Sprachen", Band 5, Lieferung 4; 1981.

5. Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft, Sprache, p. 107.

would otherwise remain unexplained.⁶ Schulze has proved in a monumental work that Latin proper names are largely of Etruscan origin: in fact the name of the Eternal City is an Etruscan word. Ancient Roman authors frankly admitted that many words of cultural import were taken into Latin from Etruscan, e.g. *histrio* "actor", *idus* "middle of the month", *balteum* "girdle", *atrium* "hall, house," *persona* "mask," etc. The Etruscan suffix *-enna* has been attached to the Latin word *levis* in *levenna*.

But the Etruscans did not only bequeath their own culture to the Latins. In the earlier period the Greek culture too was transmitted to the Latins by the Etruscans. That the Romans in reproducing Greek words in Latin often used *tenuis* for *media* is generally supposed to be due to the fact that the words concerned, before reaching the Latins, had passed through the hands of the Etruscans, in whose language no distinction was made between *tenuis* and *media* (both being usually indicated by the sign for the *tenuis*); thus Lat. *sporta*=Gr. *spurida*, Lat. *Catamitus* (cf. Etr. *Catmite*)=Gr. *Ganumêdês*. The Etruscans in fact possessed only one series of occlusives which corresponded neither to the *tenues* nor to the *mediae* of Greek and Latin. In the case of gutturals the Etruscans seem to have distinguished between labio-velar, velar and palatal like the primitive Indo-Europeans! In any case, they used three different Greek signs to indicate the guttural *tenuis* before vowels of three different timbres, e.g. KA, CE-CI, QO-QU. In imitation of the Etruscans, the early Romans too, who had received their alphabet from the Greeks through the Etruscans, began to write KA CE QU, though however there is nothing to show that the quality of the guttural *tenuis* actually varied in early Latin according to the following vowel. Now, of these three guttural-signs, K is derived from Greek Kappa and Q from Greek Koppa, but C from Greek Gamma! This is again due to the agency of the Etruscans, who apparently could not distinguish between *tenuis* and *media*. The original value of C is retained in early inscriptions (e.g. ECO=*ego*) and some frozen abbreviations such as C.=*Gaius*, CN.=*Gnaeus*. When the sign C became completely monopolised by the guttural *tenuis* in Latin, the Romans invented the new sign G (a modified form of C) to indicate the corresponding *media*.

Thus arose gradually the imposing structure of the Latin language—the dialect of Rome which at an early date had become the common speech of the whole of Latium. Classical authors like Cicero and Caesar invested it with sepulchral dignity but could not still its throbbing life. Behind its

6. Prof. Sommer however does not consider this aspiration to be sufficient proof of the Etruscan origin of *pulcher*.

frozen façade the Latin language grew and changed, and in our own day has blossomed forth into the literary and artistic languages of Italy, France and Spain besides various minor dialects. These Romance languages are not derived from the elegant literary dialect of Cicero, but from the living language called Vulgar Latin which was much different in many ways. Though the high-brow literati would not admit the change, the diphthongs in the living language were early levelled to monophthongs: *Caecilius* > *Cecilius*, *auricula* > *oricula*, etc. It is interesting to note in this connection that the literary snobs of Rome, to emphasise their superior and distinctive culture, went even so far as to diphthongise the monophthongs in the Greek loan-words they were so fond of; thus Gr. *skēnē* became *scaena* in their hands, and Gr. *skēptron* became *scaeptrum*.

It has to be admitted that classical Latin, like classical Sanskrit, was an artificial dialect spoken by none but cherished by all. This is borne out by authentic Latin inscriptions of the classical age which reveal a bewildering confusion in orthography, phonology and grammar. In an inscription of 122 B.C., for instance, we find side by side *arvorsario* and *advorsarium*, *avorsum* and *aversum*, *quai* and *quae*, and the four forms *lis*, *slis*, *litis* and *leitlis* of one and the same word. Ten years later we find in another inscription side by side the forms *oina* and *unum*, *ious* and *ius*, *poplicus* and *publicus*, etc. The stately and homogeneous Latin that we find in classical texts is in fact largely the result of propaganda by the Roman government in favour of particular forms to the exclusion of others. It is recorded in history that the Censor Appius Claudius Caecus put an end to the confusion between *s* and *r* in intervocalic position by means of a state ordinance. In this work of standardising the Latin language the Roman government received material help from poets and publicists. The poet Ennius, for instance, is said to have started the practice of reduplicating consonants in Latin orthography in proper cases, and to the scholarly freed slave Carvilius goes the credit of introducing the new sign *G* into the Latin alphabet. The grammatical endings too were by no means uniform before official standardisation. Final *-m* and *-s* were so reduced in pronunciation under certain circumstances that in the oldest inscriptions we find them often altogether dropped; thus *Cornelio*=*Cornelios*, *oino*=*unum*, *duonoro*=*bonorum*, etc. This ungrammatical suppression of the ending however became a permanent feature of the language in the words *non* < *noenum*, *nihil* < *nihilum* and *animadverto* < *animum adverto*. Final vowels of dissyllabic words were as a rule syncoped in spoken language as is clear from Plautinian prosody; and in *nec* < *neque*, *ac* < *atque*, *neu* < *neve* we see that the new form originated through the syncope of final *-e*

even succeeded in wringing recognition from orthodox grammarians. The medial *i* in *calidus aridus avidus* was dropped in the living dialect, but the literary language recognised this vowel-drop only in the case of *valde* < *validus*. In this way, through the combined efforts of the state and the literati, a standardised Latin language came into existence, which however was cultivated only by the smart set of the city and was therefore devoid of natural vitality. The living Latin was the language spoken by the artless rustics, never without sharp dialectical variations, and therefore a meet mother of the Romance languages.

The Plautinian dialect may be called archaic vulgar Latin, and as such it may claim closer relation with the Romance languages than the immaculate Latin of Cicero. It is highly significant that some peculiarities of the Romance languages can be traced back to the Plautinian dialect but not to classical Latin. The French articles *le la les*, for instance, cannot be derived directly from *ille illa illos* of classical Latin with accent on the first syllable; they presuppose Latin forms with accent on the last syllable (*illé illá illós*) the existence of which is revealed only by Plautinian prosody. In French *vingt trente quarante* etc. (from Lat. *viginti triginta quadraginta*) the syllable *-gi-* has been evidently dropped—which therefore could not have been accented, though according to the law of penultimate accent (see below) in Latin, precisely this *gi* should have been the accent-syllable in these words. This anomaly is again explained by Plautinian prosody which shows that in the spoken language the corresponding Latin words were accented *viginti triginta quadraginta*.

Latin grammarians have described the chief characteristics of vulgar speech under four heads, viz. *absonum*, *agreste*, *inconditum* and *peregrinum*. *Absonum* covers everything that was considered vulgar in a general sense by people of refinement, a typical example being *testa* ("pot") in the sense of "head": it is significant that French *tête* "head" is derived from this *testa* and not from *caput*. *Agreste* means "provincial" in the sarcastic sense, and signifies the rusticity implied in the levelling of diphthongs, etc. By the term *Inconditum* were meant grammatical irregularities in general, from which however even the state edicts were not free. The term *Peregrinum* was used by Roman grammarians to deprecate the vulgar practice of introducing foreign (chiefly Greek) words into Latin. But the extent to which spoken Latin was flooded by Greek loan-words can be guessed only from a careful study of the Romance languages. Thus French *parole* is derived from Gr. *parabolē* which seemingly had ousted the Latin equivalents in common speech; cf. also Italian *cera* "face" from Gr. *kára*, Spanish *cada* "every" from Gr. *katá*, etc.

Having thus dealt with the external influences which in various ways influenced its course of development, we shall now discuss the special laws of Latin which were chiefly responsible for the characterisation of this language as a particular dialect of the Indo-European family. The most important of these laws are perhaps those about Latin accent.

Original Indo-European accent was predominantly musical and free to choose its place on any syllable in the word as we find in Vedic Sanskrit. But already in prehistoric Latin the accent became predominantly expiratory and came to stand *always on the first syllable*. This is clearly proved by the weakening of the vowel in non-initial syllables; thus *ágō* but *éxigō* < **éx-agō*, *cánō* but *cécinī* < **cécanai*. Similar weakening may be observed also in early Greek loan-words; Gr. *Kalánē*, for instance, at first became **Cátana* in the mouth of the Romans and then became *Cátina*.

This prehistoric Latin accent was again violently disturbed in the historical period by the law of penultima which may be formulated as follows: *every stressed word has the main accent on the penultima if it is long (by nature or position), and on the antepenultima if the penultima is short*. German and French scholars are sharply divided in two national camps over the exact nature of this historical Latin accent. For this disagreement the Latin grammarians themselves are partly responsible. The older Latin grammarians declared the historical Latin accent to be musical, and this view has been on the whole accepted by the French scholars. But the older Latin grammarians were so much under Greek influence that it is not at all improbable that even when writing about their own language they were thinking of Greek, in which, it is true, the accent was predominantly musical. Later Latin grammarians however, who had to a large extent emancipated themselves from the tutelage of Greek masters, have clearly stated that the historical accent was expiratory. This view has been accepted by practically all the German scholars and elaborately justified by Professor Sommer,⁷ even though the comparatively good state in which the Indo-European vowels have been preserved in Latin may indeed seem to lend support to the opposite view.

Latin vowels were so vitally affected by the prehistoric shift of accent to the first syllable that without a careful consideration of its chief effects it is quite impossible to form any clear idea about the laws of the Latin language. Its primary effect was to retain almost unchanged the vowel of the first syllable. But its secondary result, which we shall now discuss, was the weakening of

7. Handbuch der Lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre, 2nd ed., § 72. Stolz-Leumann in Lateinische Grammatik, 5th ed., § 168, have not taken any side in this controversy.

vowels of middle syllables in various ways. The vowel *i*, for instance, changed to *e* before *r* < *s*; thus *cinis* but *cineris*. Before labials however it seems to have become an intermediate vowel between *i* and *u* appearing in both these forms; hence *uituperō* < **uitiparō*, and inscriptional *Lusumacus* besides *Lusimacus*. Similarly the vowel *u* too assumed an intermediate quality in middle syllables; thus *inclutus* and *inclitus* from **énclutos*. The vowel *a* appears as *e* in middle syllables before consonant-groups; thus *acceptus* from **ád-cap-tos*, *confectus* from **cōnfectos*. This *e*, the weakened form of *a*, further becomes *i* if the following consonant-group begins with *n* or *ñ* (thus *cōnfringō* from **cōnfrango*, *attīgō* from **áttango*), but it becomes *u* before *l*+consonant (thus *insulsus* from **énsalsos*, *conculco* from **cóncalco*).—The *e* of the middle syllable, be it the result of the weakening of *a* or an original *e*, changes into *i* before a single consonant; thus *cecidi* < **cécede* < **cécadai* from *cadō*, *abigō* < *ábago* from *agō*, *reddidi* < **réd-dedai* from *dedi*, *obsideō* < **óbsedeo* from *sedeō*. This weakening of *e* into *i* however was hindered by an immediately preceding *i* (cf. gen. sg. *parietis abietis* from *pariēs abiēs*) or immediately following vowels (cf. *aureus*, *adeō*, *moneō*) or *r* (cf. *peperi* < **péparai* from *pariō*, *camera* < *cámara* < Gr. *kamára*). It should be noted further that this weak *e* of the middle syllable developed into *u* (through *o*) before guttural *l*; thus Gr. *spatlē* > **spátelā* > **spátolā* > *spatulā*, Gr. *Sikelós* > **Síce-los* > **Sícolos* > *Siculus*. That this modification of the *e* of the middle syllable did not take place before palatal *l* is proved by the form *Sicilia* of the same place-name. Before labials the post-tonic *e* of middle syllables seems to have developed into *ü*, indicated sometimes by *u* and sometimes by *i*; thus **óccapō* > **óccepō* > **óccüpō* > *occupō*, **récapērō* > **réceperō* > **récüpe-rō* > *reciperō*. It is for this reason that we have both *optumus* and *optimus* < **-temo-* < **-tṃmo-*.—The vowel *o* normally becomes *i* in middle syllable, e.g. *cupiditās* < **cúpidotāts*; but after *i* it appears as *e*, e.g. *pietās* < **piotāts*; before guttural *l* it becomes *u* as in *sédulo* < **sē dolōd*, *epistula* < **épistola* < Gr. *epistolē*.

The diphthongs in middle syllables were reduced much more than the monophthongs as the result of the shift of accent to the first syllable in pre-historic Latin. Thus *incido* < **éncaidō* from *caedō*, *diffidō* < **disfeidō* from **feidō* = Gr. *peithō*. If *oi* too, like *ai* and *ei*, had become *i* in middle syllable is not clear; examples like *commūnis* < *commoinis* would suggest that in middle syllables post-tonic *oi* behaved in the same manner as initial tonic *oi*. Unaccented *eu* and *ou* too of middle syllables seem to have developed in the same manner as the initial accented *eu ou* (see below); but medial *au*, unlike the accented *au* of the first syllable, has been reduced (through *ou*) to *ü*; thus

excūsō < **éxcaussō* from *causa*, *conclūdō* < **cónclaudō* from *claudō*, etc.

It will be clear from the above survey that vowels of middle syllables were mostly weakened as the result of the pre-historic accent-shift. Its effect on the vowels of final syllables however was different: if uncovered, they were mostly dropped; thus Lat. *et tot quot*: Skt. *dti tāti kāti* (but cf. Lat. *pede patre*: Gr. *podí patri*; here the final *i* has been weakened but not dropped). The final *-u* of Skt. *makṣi* has been dropped in Lat. *mox*.—Short vowels of final covered syllables have on the whole developed like the short vowels of middle syllables.

As the long monophthongs of middle syllables are retained unchanged, it may be expected that they would be spared drastic modifications also in final syllables. This is however true only of the period when the weakening of short vowels was taking place. Later however, i.e. just before the beginning of Latin literature, long vowels in final syllables were vitally affected by the *Law of Iambus-shortening* which may be formulated as follows: if in a sequence of syllables of iambic rhythm the accent (word-accent or verse-ictus) lies on the short, or follows immediately after the iambus, the iambus becomes pyrrhic. That is to say, $\text{—} \text{—}$ and $\text{—} \text{—}$ become $\text{—} \text{—}$ and $\text{—} \text{—}$ respectively. There is a long controversy and a vast literature on the various aspects of this Law of Iambus-shortening. Nor is it formulated in the same manner by all the authorities. But its importance for the language will be apparent, for instance, from the fact that due to it the second syllable of every dissyllabic word of Latin is expected to be short if it begins with a light syllable. But there are numerous exceptions to this rule. Like the ungrammatical lengthening of final vowels in the Vedic language (see LIS., pp. 66-67), the iambus-shortening of Latin is essentially a phenomenon of the spoken—and therefore affected—speech. Thus in the imperative verb-form *putā* “estimate!” the length of the final vowel has been retained against the law; but it is shortened when the same word is used adverbially, thus *putā* “for example”. In paradigm, this law is very often set at naught by the force of analogy; thus from *vir* “man” we have in gen. sg. *virī*, dat. sg. *virō*, acc. pl. *virōs*—all against the law, on the analogy of corresponding flexional forms of non-iambic words such as *hortus*, *animus* etc. On the other hand, iambus-shortening influenced the final of non-iambic words; thus the short final of *terrā rēginā* etc. is at least partly due to the analogical influence of forms like *iugā* < **iugā* (Skt. *yugā*) in which the shortening of the final vowel is regular. In the first person singular, Plautus still uses the older forms *ferō volō* besides later ones *ferō volō* on which the effect of this law of iambus-shortening is unmistakable. On the whole it

may be said that isolated words were most exposed to the influence of this law.

Diphthongs in final syllables undergo the same weakening as in middle syllables, *i*-diphthongs (through \bar{e}) thus becoming \bar{i} . Through iambus-shortening this resultant long vowel may however appear as short; thus I.-E. **mebh(e)i-* (Skt. *māhy-am*) > prim. Ital. **mehei* > Old Lat. *mihei* (= *mihi*) > *mihī*. No fitting example of an *u*-diphthong in final syllable can be found, for in initial and middle syllables too it is weakened to \bar{u} as in the final syllable. The diphthong *au*, it is true, does not become \bar{u} in all non-final syllables, but then there is no sure example of final *-au* in Latin, and so it is impossible to decide if there was any difference in the behaviour of this diphthong in final and non-final syllables.

We have described at some length the direct and indirect effects of the first accent-shift in prehistoric Latin, for it is by far the greatest single factor in determining the internal history of Latin vowels of non-initial syllables, and also in lending a distinctive character to Latin vocalism. But we must not forget the second Latin accent-shift to the penultima (mentioned above) which took place within the historical period. Its effect on Latin vowels was however quite insignificant in comparison with that of the first accent-shift. That is chiefly because the vowels amenable to weakening by the second shift had been already weakened almost to the farthest limit through the first accent-shift. The only tolerably certain mutative effect of the historical accent on Latin vowels is to be found in the changes involved in *lavāre pavāre* out of **lovāre *povāre* (so Stolz—Leumann, § 77). It is not without substantial reason, therefore, that the French scholars (also Niedermann) declare this historical accent on the penultima to have been predominantly musical, for only a musical accent—the accent of the Vedic language for instance—leaves more or less undisturbed the quantity of the neighbouring vowels.

From the above survey of the effects of the prehistoric initial stress accent of Latin it will be quite clear that normal Latin representatives of Indo-European vowels are to be sought (though not always found) in the first syllable. That the normal representatives are not always found in initial syllables is chiefly due to the attraction of the vowels of second syllables (regressive assimilation) which is an important factor of Latin phonology; cf. *siliqua* < **sceliquā*, *cinis* < **cenis*, *bonus* < *duenos*, *homō* < *hemō* etc. (Sommer, pp. 112–115).—We are now sufficiently forewarned to be able to understand the history of Indo-European vowels in Latin.

I.-E. *a* has been normally retained unchanged in the first syllable; cf. Lat. *ago* : Gr. *agō* : Skt. *ājāmi*, Lat. *ager* : Gr. *agrós* : Skt. *ājrah*, etc. So also I.-E. \bar{a} ; cf. Lat. *māter* : Doric *mātēr* : Skt. *mātā*.—The two Indo-European normal

vowels *e o*, along with their long forms *ē ō*, have also been retained; cf. Lat. *est* : Gr. *esti* : Skt. *āsti*, Lat. *rēx* : Skt. *rāj-*, Lat. *potis* : Gr. *pósis* : Skt. *pātiḥ*, Lat. *nōtus* (< *gnōtus*) : Gr. *gnōtós* : Skt. *jñātāḥ*.—Also the extreme vowels *i u*, along with *ī ū*, have been normally retained in Latin; cf. Lat. *vidua* : Goth. *widuwō* : Skt. *vidhāvā*, Lat. *ovis* : Gr. *ó(v)is* : Skt. *áviḥ*, Lat. *iugum* : Gr. *zugón* : Skt. *yugám*, Lat. *ruber* : Gr. *eruthrós* : Skt. *rudhiráḥ*, Lat. *fūmus* : Gr. *thūmós* : Skt. *dhūmāḥ*.

Of the short *i*-diphthongs, *ai* was retained in the first syllable till the end of the third century B.C. as inscriptional forms like *aide* (= *aedem* : Gr. *aithō* : Skt. *édhaḥ*) clearly prove. Later however it became *ae*; cf. Lat. *caecus* : Goth. *haihs*, Lat. *haedus* : Goth. *gaitis*.—Also for *ei*, diphthongal pronunciation till 186 B.C. is guaranteed by forms like *deivos* (Skt. *devāḥ*) in inscriptions in which *ī* is not represented by *ei*. About 150 B.C., however, this diphthong had become a long *ī* in pronunciation—to the result that *ei* now began to be written also for old and genuine *ī* (inverse writing!). The intermediate stage between *ei* and *ī* was *ē* (closed *ē*) which remained unchanged if *u* followed immediately; hence *deivos* at first became **dēvos*. But as *u* before *o* is dropped in Latin excepting in absolute initial (Sommer, § 94.2), this **dēvos* further became **dēṽs*. At this stage here intervened the rhythmic law “*vocalis ante vocalem corripitur*” (LIS., p. 67), according to which every long vowel when confronted by another vowel is shortened (Sommer, § 84. 2.). Thus **dēṽs* became *deus*.—The diphthong *oi* is retained in early inscriptions in forms like *oino* (acc. sg.) “one” : Gr. *oinē*. About the middle of the second century B.C. it became *ū* in pronunciation, but *oi* as well as the intermediate form *oe* (excepting after initial labial) continued to be used as graphic archaisms (Sommer, § 63). Thus *oinos* became *oenus*—whence the classical form *ūnus*. After initial *u* and between *l* and labial or *qu* however *oi* developed into *ī* (over *ei*, *ē*); thus Lat. *vīcus* : Gr. *(v)oiḱos* : Skt. *veśāḥ*, Lat. *vīdī* : Gr. *(v)oiḱa* : Skt. *vēda*, Lat. *limus* : O. H. G. *leimo* from **iōimos*; cf. also the unreduplicating perfect form *liqui* from I.-E. **(le)loik^{wa}* (Gr. *léloipa*, Skt. *virēca*). In half a dozen words the intermediate grade *oe* has been retained in Latin after an initial labial (*poena*, *foedus* etc.) if in the second syllable there is no *i* (cf. *punire* : *poena*). It is possible that this *oe* was artificially maintained in Latin orthography on the analogy of *ae* beside *ai* (Stolz-Leumann, § 58).

Of the short *u*-diphthongs, *au* has been retained in initial syllable, e.g. Lat. *augeō* : Gr. *aúxō* : Skt. *ójah-*.—I.-E. *eu* became *ou* in primitive Italic (see inscriptional *ab-doucit*) and then *ū* in Latin; thus Lat. *dūcō* “I lead” : Goth. *tiuha*. Between *l* and Latin labial however the primitive Italic *ou* (< *eu*) became *oi*, which further changed into *ei* > *ē* > *ī*; thus Lat. *liber* “free” < **louber* :

Gr. *eleútheros*. Lat. *eu*, as in *seu neu neuter*, is always of secondary origin (Sommer, § 65). I.-E. *ou* may be seen unchanged in Old Lat. *loucom* : Skt. *lókah*. Later however it became *ū*, thus Lat. *clūnis* : Skt. *śróṇih*.

I.-E. long diphthongs have coincided with short ones in Latin and need not be discussed separately. But it is necessary to say a few words about the representation of Indo-European sonant nasals and liquids. I.-E. *ṛ* and *ṝ* appear normally as *en* and *nā* respectively in Latin ; thus I.-E. **tṛ-tó-s* : Lat. *tentus* : Skt. *tatāh* : Gr. *tatós* and I.-E. **ḡṛ-tó-s* : Lat. *gnātus* (class.*natus*) : Skt. *jātāh*. Similarly I.-E. *m̃* has normally developed into *em* (assimilated to *en* before dentals) as in Lat. *centum ventum* : Skt. *śatām gatām* from I.-E. **kṃtóm* **gʷm̃tóm*. But there is no sure example of I.-E. *m̃* in Latin. I.-E. *ṛ* and *ṝ* normally appear as *or* and *rā* ; thus I.-E. **ṛtós* **ḡṛnóm* : Lat. *ortus grānum* : Skt. *ṛtāh jīrṇām*. Similarly I.-E. *l̃* and *l̄* normally appear as *ol* and *lā* in Latin ; thus I.-E. **m̃ldú-* (Skt. *m̃ḍúh*) became **moldz(is)*, then *mollis* in Latin, and I.-E. **ul̃nā* (Skt. *úrṇā*) became in Latin **ulāna* then *lāna*.

The normal representation of Indo-European vowels in Latin as described above would however seem to be very abnormal from the stand-point of Latin, for due to various disturbing influences even in the initial syllable the normal representatives undergo disconcerting modifications. Some at least of these disturbing influences and their effects therefore have now to be discussed.

Before antevocalic *r* < *z* < *s* the vowel *i* becomes *e* ; thus I.-E. **si-sō* > **sizō* > *sērō*. Before dentals *-ri-* > *-ṛ-* > *-er-* ; thus I.-E. **tris* (=Skt. *trih*) > **tṛs* > **ters* > **terr* > *ter*.—The same *r* out of *s* changes an immediately preceding *u* to *o*—as in Lat. *foret* < prim. Ital. **fusēd*. That in Lat. *nurus* (: Skt. *snuṣā*) the *u* of the first syllable remains unchanged is due to the influence of the *u* of the second. Between *l* and labial, *u* became the middle vowel *ū*, expressed sometimes by *i* and sometimes by *u* ; thus Lat. *libet lubet* : Skt. *lúbhyati*.

The changes of *e* are multifarious. It becomes *i* before the guttural nasal ; thus I.-E. **penkʷe* > Lat. *quínque* (assimilation of *p* of the first syllable to the *qu* of the second and secondary protraction of *i*) : Skt. *pāñca*. This narrowing of *e* to *i* takes place also before the secondary *n* (written *g*) derived from *g* before *n* ; thus *lignum* (pronounced *linnum*) from *legō* "I collect", and *dignus* (pronounced *dinnus*) "worthy" from **degnos* < **decnos*. The same narrowing of *e* to *i* may be observed also before *mb*, as, for instance, in Lat. *limbus* < **lembhos* : Skt. *lāmbhate*. I.-E. *sye-* before consonant becomes **syo-* > **so-* ; thus I.-E. **syēsōr* (Skt. *svāsā*) became *soror* in Latin, and I.-E. **syēkuros* (Skt. *śvāsuraḥ*) became Lat. *socrus*. I.-E. **pekʷō* (Skt. *pācati*) at first became **quequō* through assimilation in Latin, and then further

changed to *coquō* "I cook". Before guttural *l* (i.e. *l* before *o*, *u*, *a*), *e* became *o*; thus I.-E. **k^welō* (Skt. *cārati*) became *colō* "I cultivate"; on the analogy of *colō* then in second and third person sg. *colis colit* (instead of **quelis *quelit*), much as Skt. *pácāmi* (instead of **pákāmi*) after *pácasi pácāti*. I.-E. *-eu-* became *-ou-* already in primitive Italic; thus I.-E. **neuos*: Gr. *né(v)os*: Skt. *návaḥ*: Lat. *novus*. It should be remembered therefore that Lat. *eu*, as in *brevis levis*, is always of secondary origin.

I.-E. *o* changed to *u* before the *n* of *-nc-* and *-ngu-*; thus I.-E. **onkos* "hook": Gr. *ónkos*: Skt. *aṅkādḥ*: Lat. *uncus*, I.-E. **ong^wis*: Skt. *añjih*: Lat. *unguis*. This change may be observed in some cases also before *m*; thus I.-E. **omesos* "shoulder" (Skt. *aṃsāḥ*): Lat. *umerus*. Before *l*+consonant *o* became *u* as in *sulcus* "furrow"=Gr. *holkós*. After *v* however, *o* in this position remained unchanged till the end of the Republic; thus *volnus* (Skt. *vraṇám?*)—which later became *vulnus* "wound". Lat. *ursus* < **orcsos* < **r̥k̥s̥os* (Gr. *árktos*, Skt. *ṛkṣāḥ*) suggests the same change also before *r*+consonant. In course of the second century B.C., *vo* became *ve* before *r*, *s*, *t* (Sommer, § 57.2); thus *vorsus* (Skt. *vṛttāḥ*) *voster votō* became *versus vester vetō*.—I.-E. long *ō* became *ū* in monosyllabic words; thus **bhōr* (Gr. *phōr*) became *fūr* "thief".

I.-E. semivowels have on the whole been much better preserved in Latin than the vowels; thus I.-E. **iekʷrt*: Gr. *hēpar*: Skt. *yákṛt*: Lat. *iecur*, and from I.-E. **ṛudh-* we have Skt. *yudh-* and Lat. *iubeō* "I order"; cf. also Lat. *iūvenis*: Skt. *yúvan-*. Intervocalic *ɨ* was dropped, as in Lat. *trēs*: Skt. *tráyaḥ* < I.-E. **treṛes*, Lat. *aeris*: Skt. *áyas-aḥ* < I.-E. **aṛes-os*. Intervocalic *ɨ* where found in Latin has always the value of *ɨɨ* derived mostly from *-gl-* (as in *maior* = *maḡlor* < **mag-ṛōs*: Skt. *mah-*) but also from *-dl-* (as in *peior* "worse" from **ped-ṛōs*: Skt. *pád-ya-te*). Though not in Old Latin, initial *dɨ* later became *ɨ* as in the vocative form *Iuppiter* (for *Jū-piter*) < I.-E. **dṛieu pāter*: Skt. *dyáuṣ pitā*; the Lat. ablative form *Iove* = the Skt. locative form *dyávi*. Normally however *ɨ* after consonant became syllabic (Sommer, § 93.2); thus I.-E. **medhṛos*: Skt. *mádhyah* but Lat. *medius* (trisyllabic).

I.-E. *y* is normally retained, as in Lat. *vōx videō* corresponding to Skt. *vid*, but initial *y* disappears before *l* and *r*; cf. I.-E. **y_lnā*: Skt. *āṇā*: Lat. *lāna*, and Lat. *rādix* "root" from **vrādix* (cf. Goth. *waúrts*). The sound-groups *-oyi-* and *-oye-*, of which the *y* may go back to I.-E. *g^w*, have developed in various ways in Latin; thus *mōtus vōtus tōtus nōnus* from **movitos *vovitos *tovitos *novenos*. In other cases however we find *ū*; thus *nūdus* "naked" < **nou(o)dos* < **nog^wodos* (Goth. *naqaþs*, Skt. *nagnāḥ*) and *nūndinae* "the ninth day" < **nouen-dinai*. But in non-initial syllables *oy*, as well as *ay* and *iū*, developed before vowels into *uu*, which in script however appears as *u*

excepting before *i*; thus I.-E. **uidheṽā* (Skt. *vidhāvā*) became Lat. *vidua* over **vidova*, Lat. *dēpuviō* "I strike" from **dēpauiō* (Gr. *paio* "I beat"), Lat. *trīdium* "period of three days" from **trīdiom*. Between similar vowels *u* is dropped as a rule; thus *sīs* < *sī vīs* "if you please", and *vīta* < **uiūtā* (Skt. *jivita*).—Always after *t*, but also after other consonants, *u* was vocalised; thus I.-E. **k^wetūōr-* (Skt. *catvārah*) became Lat. *quattuor* (three syllables). Since *u* was dropped before *o* as in **dēos* from *dēyos* (see supra), I.-E. **eḱuos* (Skt. *āsvah*) became **ekos* in Latin (cf. inscriptional *ecus*); the form *equos* (from which *equus*) owes its *u* to the analogy of forms like *equi* in which the *u* was retained phonologically (Sommer, § 94. 8).

The liquids *r* and *l* have been retained unchanged in Latin; cf. Lat. *arātrum* "plough": Gr. *árottron*: Skt. *arītram*, and Lat. *clūnis* "buttock": Lith. *szlaunis*: Skt. *śrōṇih*. As in modern Russian, *l* in Latin was velar (before *a*, *o*, *u*, and consonants) or palatal (before *e*, *i* and in *ll*); before the velar *l* vowels were rounded (thus *volō* from **velō*), but before the palatal *l* vowels remained unchanged (thus *velim velle* from the same verb). In Romance languages the velar and palatal *l* have developed in different ways.—The nasals *m* and *n* have on the whole been retained unchanged; cf. Lat. *māter novos* (< **nevos*): Skt. *mātā nāvaḥ*. Before *s*, however, *n* disappeared very early, protracting the preceding vowel in compensation. Even Cicero is said to have pronounced *forēsia hortēsia* instead of *forensia hortensia*. There are interesting cases of inverse writing in which *n* is used before *s* merely to indicate that the preceding vowel is long; thus inscr. *thensauro* = Gr. *thēsauros*.

Now we come to the occlusives. Of the ancient Indo-European dialects of Italy it may be said on the whole that the pure surds and sonants were preserved in them, but the sonant aspirates coincided with the surd aspirates and along with them developed into surd spirants already in *primitive Italic*. Subsequently they underwent various changes in the different dialects.

I.-E. *p* may be observed in Lat. *pater pēs septem*: Skt. *pitā pad- saptā*.—I.-E. *b*, which was a very rare sound, may perhaps be found in Lat. *bucca* "puffed out cheek": Skt. *bukkārah*.—Initially I.-E. *bh* became *f* (cf. Lat. *ferō*: Skt. *~bhārāmi*, Lat. *frāter*: Skt. *bhrātā*), but otherwise *b* (e.g. Lat. *lubet*: Skt. *lubh-*); cf. also I.-E. **albhos* "white": Gr. *alphós*: Lat. *albus*: Umbr. *alfu*. Lat. *spargō spernō* may be connected with Skt. *sphārjati sphurāti*, but the labial in them need not have been aspirated originally, for contact with *s* often induces aspiration in Sanskrit (cf. Lat. *spūma*: Lith. *spāine*: Skt. *phēnaḥ*).—The unaspirated dentals have been well preserved in Latin; cf. Lat. *trēs pater est*: Skt. *trāyaḥ pitā āsti*, and Lat. *dōnum edere*: Skt. *dānām ādmi*. As *d* and *l* are very similar sounds, Latin often shows *l* instead of *d*;

thus from I.-E. **daiuer*- "brother-in-law" we have Skt. *devār*-, Gr. *dāēr* (< **dai-vēr*), but Lat. *lēvir* (< **laever*). In Latin, *l* and *d* alternate sometimes in one and the same word; thus *lingua* : *dingua* "tongue", *lacrima* : *dacruma* "tear", etc. In Middle Indo-Aryan, *d* often became *l* through *ḍ*; in Latin however the process of change was quite different.—Examples like Lat. *rota* "wheel": Skt. *rāthaḥ* do not necessarily prove the change of I.-E. *th* to *t* in Latin, for there is nothing to prove that the aspiration of the dental in the Sanskrit form was not a later development.—I.-E. *dh* has developed into three distinct sounds under different circumstances. Initially it became *f*; thus I.-E. **dhūmós* : Skt. *dhūmāḥ* : Lat. *fūmus*. Medially it became *d*; thus Skt. *mādhyah* *vidhāvā* : Lat. *medius vidua*. In the neighbourhood of *r* it became *b*; I.-E. **uerdhom* (Engl. *word*) : Lat. *verbum*, Skt. *ūdhar* : Lat. *ūber*.

Of Indo-European palatals, *ḱ* normally appears in Latin as *c* (always pronounced *k*); thus I.-E. **ḱmtóm* : Skt. *śatám* : Lat. *centum*; from I.-E. **ḱens* come Lat. *cēseō* and Skt. *śámsati*; cf. also I.-E. **deiḱ*- : Lat. *dicō* : Skt. *disāti*, etc.—I.-E. *ǵ* in the same way has developed into *g* (always pronounced hard) in Latin; thus from **ǵen*- Lat. *genus* : Skt. *jánaḥ*, from **ǵīnom* Lat. *grānum* and Skt. *jīrṇám*.—I.-E. *ǵh* became (over *χ*) *h* in initial position before vowel; thus from I.-E. **ǵheiem*- Lat. *hiems* "winter": Gr. *ḱheīma* : Skt. *himāḥ*. So also medially between vowels; thus from I.-E. **ueǵh*- Lat. *vehō* : Av. *vazaiti* : Skt. *váhati*. Before and after consonant however *ǵh* developed into *g** (cf. Lat. *gliscō* "I blaze up": O.H.G. *glei-mo* "glow-worm": Gr. *khliō* : Lith. *zleà*; Lat. *fiŋgō* "I frame": Gr. *teĩkhos* < **théikhos* : Skt. *deh̥t* < **dheh̥t* from I.-E. **dheiǵh*-). I.-E. *sḱh* has developed into *sc* in Latin; cf. Lat. *scindō* "I split": Skt. *chid-* from I.-E. **sḱhid-*.—As for the pure velars, we have *k* in Lat. *cruor* (: Gr. *kréas* : Skt. *kraviḥ*), *g* in Lat. *augeō* "I increase" (Skt. *ójaḥ* : Goth. *auka*), and *gh* as *h* in Lat. *hostis* (< I.-E. **ghostis* : Goth. *gasts* : O. Ch. Sl. *gostī*) and as *g* in Lat. *longus* (< **dlonghos* : O. Ch. Sl. *dlǫgŭ* : Goth. *laggs*).

I.-E. labio-velars developed into guttural+*u* in primitive Latin. Thus I.-E. *k^w* > *qu*, cf. Lat. *quattuor* : Gr. *téttares* : Skt. *catvāraḥ*, Lat. *seḱuor* : Gr. *hépomai* : Skt. *sácate*. After nasal, I.-E. *g^w* appears as *gu* as in *unguen* : Skt. *añjih*, but as *v* in all other positions; cf. I.-E. **g^wiyo*s : Skt. *jīvaḥ* : Lat. *vivos*, I.-E. **nog^wodhos* : Skt. *nag-ndḥ* : Lat. *nūdus* < **novodos*, I.-E. **g^wem*- (: Gr. *bainō*) : Lat. *veniō* : Skt. *gam-*.—Initial I.-E. *g^wh* became *f* in Latin; thus Lat. *formus* : Gr. *thermós* : Skt. *gharmāḥ*. Otherwise however *g^wh* became *v* (but *g* after *n*); thus I.-E. **uog^whelo* : Lat. *voveō* "I vow" : Skt. *vāghát-* "pray-er", I.-E. **dheg^wh*- : Skt. *dáhati* < **dhaghati* : Lat. *foveō* "I keep warm". From I.-E. *(*s*)*neig^wh*- (Goth. *snaiws* "snow") we have *ninguit* "it

snows" with the nasal infix; but as the labial element of labio-velars is lost in Latin before consonants, we have from the same base *nix* "snow" in nom. sg.; hence also *coctus* "cooked" from *coquo* (< **pekʷō*), and *socius* "associate" (< **soḱʷlos*) from *sequor* (Skt. *sácate*).

Of the spirants let us mention that I.-E. *s* in intervocalic position became *z* already in primitive Italic and further changed to *r* in Latin-Faliscian and Umbrian; thus **ausōsā* (Skt. *uṣāḥ*) became *aurōra* in Latin. An original *r* in the following syllable however prevents this rhotacism; hence *miser*, *caesar* etc. An intervocalic *s* is often in reality *ss*; thus *causa*=*saussa*. Non-intervocalic *r* instead of *s* is due to analogy; cf. *honor arbor* after the genitive forms *honoris arboris*.

(To be continued)

MISCELLANEA

(1)

AN UNNOTICED REFERENCE TO VIJAYANAGARA

Robert Sewell, while narrating the history of the arrival of the Portuguese in India, writes thus :—"Da Gama sailed on July 8, A.D. 1497, and arrived close to Calicut on August 26, 1498. . . . Da Gama returned shortly after to Portugul. Early in 1500 A.D. Cabral took out another and larger fleet, and arrived at Calicut on September 13th. He at once quarrelled with the Samuri, and instead of peaceful commerce we read of attacks and counter-attacks in such sort by the Portuguese as irretrievably to alienate the natives of the country. A few Europeans, however, settled in that tract, and amongst them Duarte Barbosa, the celebrated chronicler of the time."¹

Of the three Portuguese travellers mentioned above we select Cabral. Sewell has nothing more to say about Cabral than what he has written above. But the recently published account of the voyages of Cabral,² however, contain a very short but interesting description of Vijayanagara, which it is the object of this paper to bring to the notice of students of Indian history. Pedro Alvares Cabral was a famous Portuguese mariner of his time. He undertook his voyages to Brazil and India in the early days of 1500. In the course of his voyage he touched the harbour of Cochin, where his fleet was to be loaded with spices. While here he received two Christian priests from the neighbouring settlements of Cranganore. They belonged to the Syrian Church. But they had sent word to Cabral asking permission to be taken to Portugal, so that from there they might go to Rome and Jerusalem. This request was readily granted.

Of the two Syro-Malabar Christian priests one was Priest Mathias who, however, died either on the voyage or soon after his arrival in Portugal. His brother was Priest Joseph with whom we are here concerned. Priest Joseph reached Lisbon safely, and was well received by the king. He remained in Portugal for six months, and then was sent with a companion to Rome where he had an audience with the Pope. From Rome he went to Venice, whence he returned to India carrying greetings from the Pope.³

1. Robert Sewell, *A Forgotten Empire (Vijayanagara)*, p. 116 (London, 1924).

2. *The Voyages of Pedro Alvares Cabral to Brazil and India*. The Hakluyt Society, Second Series. No. lxxxi. Issued for 1937. Translated from contemporary documents and narratives by William Brooks Greenlee. London. MCMXXXVIII.

3. Greenlee, *ibid.*, p. 95.

Concerning Priest Joseph and what he saw in India, we have the following in the account of the voyages of Pedro Alvares Cabral :—

“Up to this point we have told about all the country which is found along the sea, beginning at Ormus, as far as Cranganore and the kingdom of Cuchin. We shall now tell about the regions inland. Towards the mountains and about three hundred miles distant from the sea is to be found a very powerful king, who is named King Narsindo, and he has a great city with three circuits of walls. It is called Bisnegal (Bisnagar). This King, as Priest Joseph told, he has seen with his own eyes, when he goes with an army against his enemies, he takes with him eight hundred elephants, four thousand horses, and innumerable foot soldiers, and he says that his camp from south to north is thirty miles long, and from west to east, of equal breadth. Consequently it may be supposed that his kingdom is very extensive, and furthermore, according to what Priest Joseph says, it is three thousand miles around. Its faith is idolatrous. Now we turn to the region next to the sea, and first begin from Cuchin towards the east and India.”⁴

Our object is to identify “the king Narsindo” mentioned above, and to estimate the value of the description of Vijayanagara as given in the travels of Pedro Alvares Cabral. In order to do this we have to ascertain when exactly Priest Joseph was in Vijayanagara. According to the translator and editor William Brooks Greenlee, Priest Joseph “may have been the Syro-Malabarian parish priest of Cranganore, ‘who came from Portugal’ in 1518.... At any rate, the detailed account of South-west India which was obtained from him and is here published was probably printed either in Rome or in Venice prior to 1505, since extracts were incorporated in the so-called letter of Dom Manuel to the king of Castile, which was printed at Rome in that year.”⁵

It is evident, therefore, that there is some uncertainty as to the precise year when Priest Joseph visited Vijayanagara. Assuming that his account was printed before 1505, let us proceed with the question of the identity of the Vijayanagara king mentioned by him. The year 1505 falls within the reign of Vira Narasimha (1504-1509 A.D.).⁶ There is no doubt that this monarch was also called Nrsimha.⁷ But “king Narsindo” mentioned by Priest Joseph cannot be identified with Vira Narasimha. For if it is assumed that the account of Priest Joseph was printed before 1505, then, we have to suppose that that Syro-Malabar priest saw the Vijayanagara king

4. Greenlee, *op. cit.*, pp. 112-113.

5. *Ibid.*, p. 96.

6. Rice, *Mysore and Coorg from the Inscriptions*, p. 118.

7. *Ibid.*

some five or ten years before 1505. That is to say, it would not be wrong to place the visit of Priest Joseph to Vijayanagara prior to 1500, when Vira Narasimha's father Narasa was ruling (1496-1503, A.D.).⁸

Between father and son there was a great difference. It is true that the manner in which the famous general Narasa became monarch is still a knotty problem in Vijayanagara history. But it seems certain that there was civil war in Vijayanagara in about 1496 between the last worthless representative of the Sāluva line, Immaḍi Narasinga Oḍeyar (1493-1496 A.D.), and General Narasa resulting in the final triumph of the latter. Opinion is divided as to the epithet posterity should give to General Narasa—a rebel or a constitutional monarch. According to some, General Narasa became monarch after murdering Immaḍi Narasinga Oḍeyar ;⁹ but others maintain that the nobles deposed Immaḍi Narasinga Oḍeyar and placed General Narasa on the throne.¹⁰ The latter view is based on the account of Fernão Nuniz, who writes thus :—"At last the King believed, and seeing now how great was the danger, he resolved to flee by the gates on the other side ; and so he left his city and palaces, and fled. When it was known by the captain that the King had fled he did not trouble to go after him, but took possession of the city and of the treasures which he found there ; and he sent to acquaint his lord, Narsyngua. And after that Narsyngua was raised to be king."

In the next statement of Nuniz we have the clue to the solution of the problem of Priest Joseph's assertions. Nuniz continues thus :—"And as he (*i.e.*, Narsyngua) had much power and was beloved by the people, thenceforward this kingdom of Bisnaga was called the kingdom of Narsyngua."¹¹

According to Nuniz, therefore, Narasa was beloved by the people ; and it was after him that the kingdom of Bisnagar came to be known as the kingdom of Narasinga. Nuniz further informs us that Narasa reigned for forty years—a statement that is not at all borne out by epigraphic evidence which gives him only seven years of rule¹²; that he extended the Vijayanagara dominions by reconquering the territories lost in the times of his predecessors ; that "at his death" (he) left all the kingdom in peace ; and that he was a great promoter of foreign trade, especially in horses.¹³

Priest Joseph's description obviously applies to such a monarch, whom he aptly styles as "a very powerful king", and as one who "goes

8. Rice, *op. cit.*, p. 118.

9. Rice, *ibid.*, p. 117.

10. Sewell, *op. cit.*, p. 108.

11. *Ibid.*, p. 307.

12. Rice, *ibid.*, p. 118.

13. Sewell, *op. cit.*, p. 307.

with an army against his enemies" taking with him 800 elephants, 4,000 horse, and innumerable foot. Priest Joseph could not have referred to Vira Narasimha, whose reign was shorter than that of his father, who spent most of his time in making gifts to temples and holy places in the Empire, and whose reign was devoid of any military glory.¹⁴

Cabral's account is, therefore, important because it embodies the first description of Vijayanagara by an Indian Christian eye-witness from south-western India. One or two details in it are worthy to be noted. In the account of Cabral we are told that king "Narsindo" had "a great city with three circuits of walls." These three circuits of walls were also noticed by Varthema, 'Abdur Razzāk, and Paes.¹⁵ Like Priest Joseph, Varthema saw the Vijayanagara king who, according to Sewell, was Narasimha.¹⁶ But since we know that Varthema visited Vijayanagara between the years 1502 and 1508,¹⁷ we have to assume that he came to Vijayanagara either in the closing years of king Narasa's reign or in the reign of Vira Narasimha.

There is another detail in the account of Priest Joseph and in that of Varthema which requires a passing notice. The Syro-Malabar Christian, "as we have already remarked, tells us that the Vijayanagara monarch had under him 800 elephants, 4,000 horse, and a huge infantry. That is to say, king Narasa, whom Priest Joseph "has seen with his own eyes", commanded a powerful contingent of elephants, a very large infantry, and only 4,000 horse. But when Varthema came to Vijayanagara soon after, he saw a smaller contingent of elephants but a larger number of horse. We are told by Varthema that the Vijayanagara monarch "keeps up constantly 40,000 horsemen and 400 elephants."¹⁸ We are not in a position to explain this disparity in the number of the different contingents mentioned by Priest Joseph and Varthema. All that we may do is to suppose that in view of the growing strength of the Muhammadans in the north, the Vijayanagara monarch saw the desirability of reducing the number of elephants and of increasing that of horses. Whatever that may be, there seems to be little doubt that of the two Christian travellers, Priest Joseph and Varthema, the former was earlier in point of time, and that he was probably the only Indian Christian visitor to the Court of the celebrated Narasinga, the founder of the Tuluva dynasty of Vijayanagara.

B. A. SALETORÉ

14. Rice, *op. cit.*, p. 118.

15. Saletore, *Social and Political Life in the Vijayanagara Empire*, I, p. 123 (Madras, 1934).

16. Sewell, *ibid.*, p. 118.

17. Saletore, *ibid.*, I, p. 45.

18. Sewell, *ibid.*, p. 118.

(2)

ON SOME WORDS IN THE INSCRIPTIONS OF AŚOKA

. I. *Bhāge amñe* in R. E. VIII.

The last sentence of Rock Edict VIII (Girnar version) reads :—

एसा भूय रति भवति देवानं पियस पियदसिनो राज्ञो भागे अंजे । The passage भागे अंजे has been differently interpreted. Bühler and other early writers take it to mean “in exchange for past pleasure.” Apparently they Sanskritized the passage as भागे अन्ये । Lüders and Hultzsch however think it impossible and point out that “in the eastern dialect the two locatives would end in *asi*.” According to Hultzsch,¹ भागे अंजे = Sanskrit भागः अन्यः means “second period.” Bhandarkar² thinks that भागे अंजे would mean “unusual luck, extraordinary fortune.” None of the above interpretations appears to be quite satisfactory. I would like to suggest that भागे अंजे = Sanskrit भग्नं अन्यत् (= अपरसुखानि भग्नानि) । The word भाग can be derived from Sanskrit भग्न (from the root भञ्ज्) through the intermediate form भग्न (cf. also Hindī भागना); and of the numerous meanings of the word we may take note of “checked,” “marred,” “defeated,” etc. What Aśoka means to say is that from the time of his first *Dharma-yātrā* (= *Tīrtha-yātrā*) to Sambodhi (= Bodh Gayā)³ pilgrimage to holy places became the chief pleasure for the king, while all other pleasures were thought to be insignificant in comparison with that.⁴

1. *C.I.I.*, I, p. 15.

2. Aśoka, 2nd ed., p. 322.

3. Sambodhi and Mahābodhi mean the same thing, “the great enlightenment (of Lord Buddha),” and in a secondary sense “the place where the great enlightenment was attained.” That Bodh Gayā was also called Mahābodhi is proved beyond doubt by the Bodhgayā temple inscription of Dharmapāla.

Cf. श्रेष्ठानामेव मल्लानां महाबोधिनिवासिनां (*Gaudalekhamālā*, p. 31). The tree under which the great enlightenment was attained has likewise been called Sambodhi in the *Kalīṅgabodhi Jātaka* (Bhandarkar, *op. cit.*, p. 321).

4. The suggestion with which Dr. Sircar concludes his note is welcome. But the argument by which he arrives at the conclusion is open to dispute. According to the Girnar dialect, *bhāge* must be equated with a neuter word, such as Sk. *bhāgyam*, and not with *bhāgaḥ*; cp. *paṭibhāgo* in R. E. XIII

II. *Ithihakha-mahāmāta* in R. E. XII.

The duties of the officer called *Ithihakha-mahāmāta* (= *Stryadhyakṣa-Mahāmātra*) in Rock Edict XII (Girnār version) have never been satisfactorily determined. There can however be no doubt that the *Stryadhyakṣa-mahāmātras* are the same as the *Dārādhyakṣa* or *Stryadhyakṣa* of the *Mahābhārata*.⁵ The following verses would clearly point to the duties of these officers :—

ततो वृद्धा महाराज योषितां रक्षिणो नराः ।

राजदारानुपादाय प्रययुनगरं प्रति ॥

Salyaparva, 29. 63.

ततो दुर्याधनामात्याः साश्रुकण्ठा भृशानुराः ।

राजदारानुपादाय प्रययुनगरं प्रति ।

वेत्तव्यासक्तहस्ताश्च दाराध्यक्षा विशाम्पते ॥

शयनीयानि शुभ्राणि स्पृङ्ग्यास्तरणवन्ति च ।

समादाय ययुस्तूर्णं नगरं दाररक्षिणः ॥

आस्थायोश्वतरीयुक्तान् स्यन्दनानपरे जनाः ।

स्वान् स्वान् दारानुपादाय प्रययुनगरं प्रति ॥

Ibid., verses 68-70.

ह्यध्यक्षांश्चाब्रवीद्राजा यानानि विविधानि मे ।

सज्जीक्रियन्तां सर्वाणि शिविकाश्च सहस्रशः ॥

Āśramavāsikaparva, 22, 20.

द्रौपदीप्रमुखाश्चापि स्त्रीसंघाः शिविकायुताः ।

ह्यध्यक्षगुप्ताः प्रययुर्विसृजन्तोऽमितं वसु ॥

The above verses appear to prove that *Stryadhyakṣas* or *Dārādhyakṣas* were bigger officers under whom were placed the *Dārarakṣins* or

(Girnār text): *tadōpayā eṣā bhūya rati bhavati; devānaṃpiyasa bhāge amñe* "From this undertaking arises greater delight. The other is the portion of king Piyadasi, Beloved of the Gods." Pali *upāya* means "an undertaking."—B. M. B.

5. H. C. Raychaudhuri, *Political History of Ancient India*, 4th ed., p. 262.

*Yoṣidhākṣins.*⁶ The former is possibly called *Amātya* in one of the verses quoted above. Their duty was to guard the ladies of the royal harem, especially when the latter were out of the harem. They were also in charge of conveyances. The *Dārarakṣins* were responsible for the conveyance of beddings and other articles to be used by the ladies. They were generally old men. The verses prove that none of the above designations refers to female officials.

III. *Kaṭābhikāra* in R. E. V.

कताभीकारेसु (Girnār) कटाभिकाले (Kālsī and Dhauli), कितभिकरो (Shāhbāzgarhī) or कटभिकर (Mānsehrā)=Sanskrit कृताभिकार, कृताभीकार is found in Rock Edict V. It is said that those who were कृताभिकार would get अपलिबोध (= अवन्धन), The word is translated "victim of a trick" (Senart), "overwhelmed by misfortune" (Bühler) and "bewitched (incurably ill ?)" (Hultzsch). A कृताभिकार prisoner appears to me to have been one whose crime was due not to his own initiative, but to the insinuation of interested persons.

IV. *Duāhale* in S.R.E. I.

The word दुआहले is found in the Separate Rock Edict I (Dhauli line 16 and Jaugaḍa line 8). It has been interpreted by some scholars as द्वि=आहरः=द्वयाहरः, "producing two (effects)" and by others as दुर्+आहरः=दुराहरः, "(service) badly rendered." The second interpretation however can be tacitly given up, as the language of the Edicts permits only the form दुलाहले for दुराहरः। दुआहले=द्वयाहरः। seems to me to indicate द्विभावेन सम्पादनं=द्विमनस्कतया सम्पादनं=एकाग्रहीनतया सम्पादनं, i.e. performance of one's duty not in a single way or with one mind, that is to say, without proper attention and eagerness.

DINES CHANDRA SIRCAR.

6. It may also be suggested that the *Dārādhyakṣas* and *Dārarakṣins* were the same. The text however appears to indicate that they were different. Each lady of the harem had a *Dārarakṣin* for her protection,

(3)

SOME DATES OF THE KUṢĀṆA KHAROṢṬHĪ RECORDS
AND THEIR BEARING ON THE INITIAL YEAR OF
THE KUṢĀṆA ERA.

It has been supposed by scholars that the initial year of the Kuṣāṇa era can be determined with the help of a few recorded *Kuṣāṇa* dates mentioned along with some *Nakṣatras*. Various scholars have tried to work out these dates with a view to find out the initial year. Out of the dated Kuṣāṇa records only two may be taken into consideration as they alone mention the name of the *Nakṣatras*. Thus the Zeda inscription¹ of the year 11 of king Kaniṣka mentions *Uttara-phālguna* Nakṣatra on the 20th day of the month of Āṣāḍha (*Sam̐ 10 1 Asadasa masasa di 20 Uttaraphalguna*). The Uṇḍ inscription² of the year 61 mentions *Pūrvāṣāḍha* Nakṣatra on the eighth day of the month Caitra (*Sam̐ 20 20 20 1 Cetrasa maha(sa)sa divase athami di 4 4*).

These astronomical dates have been worked out by many eminent scholars. Thus Prof. Sten Konow through the help of his Dutch friend Von de Wijk came to the conclusion that the Kuṣāṇa era was started in the year 134 A.D.³ Later on Prof. Konow changed his views and fixed the initial year of the Kuṣāṇa era in 128-29 A.D. Here he points out "Dr. Von Wijk had done so (*Acta Orientalia* iii. pp. 83 ff.; v. pp. 168 ff.) and arrives at the result that the only set of years within the limits with which we can reasonably reckon, which fulfils the conditions is Kaliyuga 3240 for the Zeda and 3290 for the Uṇḍ inscription. The initial year of the Kuṣāṇa era would accordingly be A.D. 128-29⁴." Besides Prof. Sten Konow, so far as I know, three Indian scholars have tried to fix the initial year of the Kuṣāṇa era on the basis of these astronomical data. Mr. Haricharan Ghosh fixed at 89 A.C. (expired) for the Zeda inscription, that is to say, the Kuṣāṇa era, according to him was started in 78 A.C. (expired) or 79 current. He however held that Kaniṣka started the Śaka era.⁵ Later on Mr. Dharendra Nath Mukherjee, published his own calculations of these dates along with a few others which need not be considered here, and came to the conclusion that the Kuṣāṇa era should

1. Sten Konow : *Corpus Inscr. Ind.*, Vol. II, Pt. I, p. 142.

2. *Ibid.*, p. 170. 3. *Indian Historical Quarterly*, Vol. II, 1926, p. 180.

4. *Corpus Inscr. Ind.*, Vol. II, Pt. I, p. xciii.

5. *Indian Historical Quarterly*, Vol. IV, 1928, p. 764.

be identified with the Vikrama era of 57 B.C.⁶ Recently I had occasion to discuss these astronomical dates with Mr. P. C. Sen Gupta. He very kindly informed me that according to his calculations 80 A.D. is the initial year of Kuṣāṇa era. Unfortunately I had to do my own calculations and I have come to a different conclusion. This has led me to believe that these astronomical data are insufficient and they can be hardly relied upon. They cannot be a safe ground for building any theory as regards the initial year of the Kuṣāṇa era. They are fragile supports which are bound to collapse and bring down the entire structure which we may try to build up.

Through the help of Pandit Kedar Nathji in charge of Jaipur Maharaja's astronomical observatory, I was able to gather the following information regarding the movements of the Nakṣatras and the naming of the months from the *Aṣṭādhyāyī*. The following Sūtra may be taken into consideration :—

सास्मिन्पौर्णमासीति (४।२।२६) ।

इति शब्दात् सञ्ज्ञायामिति लभ्यते । पौषी पौर्णमासी अस्मिन् पौषो मासः ।

This means the month Pauṣa is that month in which the Puṣya *nakṣatra* must fall on the full-moon day. This phenomenon occurs every year. The month is called Pauṣa because on the full-moon occurs the *nakṣatra* Puṣya. Accordingly it can be pointed out in the case of other months also. The month Caitra is so called because the Citrā *nakṣatra* falls on the full-moon day. There is another Sūtra :—

नक्षत्रेण युक्तः कालः ४।२।३ । पुष्येण युक्तं पौषमहः । पौषो रात्रिः ।

A day or night is said to be connected with an asterism when the moon is in conjunction with it during that time. Thus *Puṣya*, *Tiṣya*, *Maghā* &c. are lunar asterisms ; when the full-moon is in any of these asterisms then the necessary affix is added to the name of the asterism, in order to denote the month through the time of such a conjunction. We have accordingly come to the conclusion that the months are named after the Nakṣatras which fall on the full-moon day. Accordingly for our purpose we may say that *Āṣāḍha Nakṣatra* should be on the Full Moon day of the month of *Āṣāḍha* and *Citrā Nakṣatra* should be on the Full Moon day of the month of *Caitra*.

Now taking these two dates into consideration, we may see if on the 20th day of the Month of *Āṣāḍha* in the case of Zeda inscription we have *Uttaraphālguni Nakṣatra* and on the 8th day of the month of *Caitra* in the case of Uṇḍ inscription we have *Pūrvāṣāḍha Nakṣatra*.

Thus counting from Mūla next to Jyeṣṭha *Nakṣatra* which was on the full-moon day of the month of Jyeṣṭha, we find that the 21st *Nakṣatra* is Uttaraphālguna. Now according to the wording of the inscription the 20th *Nakṣatra* should have been Uttaraphālguna. This can however be explained by the fact that two consecutive *nakṣatras* may sometimes fall on the same day so that on the 20th day may have occurred the Uttaraphālguna *Nakṣatra*. Counting in the same way from the Hastā, next to Uttaraphālguna *Nakṣatra* which occurs on the full-moon day of the month of Phālguna, we find that the 8th *Nakṣatra* is Pūrṇāṣāḍha. Thus it would not be safe to rely on these astronomical data mentioned above for establishing any theory as regards the initial year of the Kuṣāṇa era, as they are of an insufficient character.

BAIJ NATH PURI.

(4)

FURTHER EVIDENCE ON GODDESS NANA AS MOTHER
GODDESS AMBĀ.

In the last issue of the Indian Culture Vol. VII, No. 2 I have contributed an article on Goddess Nana or Nanaia, the Mother Goddess in India and Western Asia. I have tried to show that this goddess Nana found on the Kuṣāṇa coins should be identified with the Mother Goddess Ambā or Ambitamā of the Ṛgvedic period. Her association with god OHPO or Śiva has been testified to by the classical references. In that paper it is also shown that the goddess Nana was also worshipped in Western Asia. I have now been able to acquire some more evidence in support of my conclusions and in this short note I shall try to show her relation with the Kuṣāṇa Kings also.

In my paper I pointed out that it first appeared to me that this goddess Nana was Durgā because on one coin of Sapaleizes the name Nanaia is associated with a lion (p. 266 ; ref. Whitehead, Catalogue, p. 168). But I further pointed out that according to Hindu Iconographical conceptions Ambā has also a lion as her Vāhana. Ambā is seated upon a lion and has three eyes. She has in one left hand a mirror. Her one right hand is held in the Varadā-*pose*. In the

other two hands she holds the shield (T. Gopi Nath Rao : Hindu Iconog. Vol. I, Part II, Page 358). Therefore, in order that Nana should be identified with Ambā it was natural that she should have a lion as her Vāhana. In the last paper I had pointed out only the name Nanaia appearing with the figure of a lion, but now I have been able to trace out a coin where Nana appears in person along with her Vāhana lion. This coin is in the British Museum Cabinet, and it was mentioned by Whitehead in the supplementary list of his catalogue of coins in the Punjab Museum (p. 214, No. 10, pl. 20). *Here Nana is actually seated on a lion.* What more do we require for proving that Nana must be identified with the Mother Goddess Ambā? It should now be accepted without a shadow of doubt that Nana or Nanaia was in fact the Mother Goddess Ambā whose association with OHPO=Śiva or Rudra is not only testified to by the numismatic evidence but is also corroborated by classical literary evidence.

As regards the relation of Nana to the Kuṣāṇas I have been able to trace out another Kuṣāṇa coin which clearly reveals that the Mother Goddess Nana or Ambā was actually worshipped by the Kuṣāṇa King Huviṣka. There is a coin noticed by Cunnigham (Num. Chron., 1892, p. 118) and also by Whitehead (p. 207, No. 29 unrepresented type). This throws much light on the religion of the Kuṣāṇa King Huviṣka. From the Māt Inscription we learn that during his time the Devakula of his Pitāmahā, who was a 'Satya-dharmasthita', was repaired by a Bakanapati. We shall be able to throw more light on the religion of the Kuṣāṇas some other time, but here it may be pointed out that this particular coin shows that the Mother Goddess Nana=Ambā had become so much popular that the even the Kuṣāṇa King Huviṣka became a convert to her cult.

BAIJ NATH PURI.

REVIEWS

THE ARCHAEOLOGY OF GUJARAT (including Kathiawar), by Hasmukh D. Sankalia, Professor of Proto-Indian and Ancient Indian History, Deccan College Post-Graduate and Research Institute, Poona. Published by Natwar Lal & Co., Bombay. Price Rs. 15/-.

The present book is the revised edition of the thesis submitted by the author for the Ph.D. Degree in Archaeology of the University of London. Ever since the publication of the Memoir on Northern Gujarat and Kathiawar by Burgess and Cousens of the Archaeological Survey of India, Gujarat presented a scope for research work to the Indologists. A History of Gujarat from the year 850 B.C. to 1300 A.D. was begun by Pandit Bhagawanlal Indraji and completed by A. M. T. Jackson. It was published in the Bombay Gazetteer, Vol. I. Part I. (1896), with an introduction by Sir James Campbell. This work dealt entirely with the Political History of Gujarat, and no attempt was made to correlate the historical monuments with their epigraphs. The present book, as the author himself points out, is written with the intention of critically studying "the entire Archaeological material, prehistoric as well as historic, of Gujarat and Kathiawar especially with the view to correlating the monuments of both these regions with the epigraphs from the early historical times to the end of the 14th Century." In trying to attempt this, the author, as was natural, is not very successful. He himself admits that except in the case of a few monuments of the Cālukyas, definite relations could not be established between the monuments and the epigraphs.

The author takes us, as it were, in an aeroplane over the range of the history of Gujarat and shows us every part of it. This is alright so far as it goes, but one feels that the author should have also paused and considered some of the very important topics in greater detail. He says nothing e.g. about Gurjara and Ahir tribes that entered into Gujarat. He could have gone into greater details about the Lakuliśa sect as Lakuliśa was born at Karvan in Baroda; nor has he told us anything about the Nāgara Brāhmins and the Guhilots. This is just what might be legitimately expected of a thorough and critical scholar like Prof. Sankalia who is also an ethnologist.

Nevertheless, the author has handled the subject in a very systematic and scientific manner. The book is divided into five parts. The first part deals with the Geography of Gujarat and its history from the time of the Mauryas down to the time of the Cālukyas in the mediaeval period. Fresh chapters are allotted to different periods of history without breaking the chronological chain. In the second part the author deals with the Architecture and Sculp-

ture of Gujarat. The architecture of Ancient, Early Mediaeval and Mediaeval Period is treated in separate sections. But Gujarat had been the centre of Śaiva, Vaiṣṇava and Brahmā temples which drew votaries from close and far off quarters. On the basis of the ruins of the temples the author has summed up his conclusions. The chapter on Hindu Iconography is very well treated. Beside the Hindu Images, a good many images of Jain Tīrthaṅkaras have also been found. The next part deals with Epigraphy and Numismatics. In the chapter on Epigraphy he deals with all the matters relating to a record, namely, material, size, script, era, style and matter, mythical allusions, opening and closing formulae, invocations and emblems. Among the coins, he has considered Pre-Greek, Greek, Kṣatrapa, Roman, Gupta and Traikūṭaka coins. The last part deals with Administration, Society, Religion and Gujarat's contribution to Indian Culture. We however sincerely hope that when each one of these chapters swells later on into a bigger Volume, he would go into greater details.

On the whole the book is well written and the subject systematically handled. There is an interconnectedness between the topics into which the book is divided and we obtain an excellent bird's eye view of Gujarat as a whole. The book is usefully furnished with maps and illustrations and is well got up.

D. R. BHANDARKAR.

ĀCĀRYA-PUṢPĀṆJALĪ VOLUME, in honour of Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar.

The above Volume which consists of articles contributed by admirers, friends and pupils was presented on the 12th July 1940 to Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar in appreciation of the most valuable services he has rendered to the Indian History and Culture and particularly for the services he has rendered to the cause of the Indian Research Institute by being an editor of its Journal 'Indian Culture'. Most of these articles are by distinguished scholars from all parts of India and Europe, prompted by the single desire of doing honour to his scholarship. The unique feature of this Volume is the range and variety of subjects selected by the scholars. If we just look at its table of contents we find the names of such world-renowned savants as Prof. H. Lüders, Prof. Sten Konow, Dr. Josef Strzygowski, Prof. A. B. Keith, Dr. Sir Ganga Nath Jha and Dr. A. K. Coomaraswamy. Another noticeable feature of this Volume is that it contains learned and thoughtful articles from the pens of three European ladies well-known in the realm of letters. With what feelings of regard most of these scholars have contributed their papers may be seen, e.g., from

the introduction to his article by Prof. Lüders. "The scholar to whom this Volume is dedicated," says the German savant, "has solved so many riddles connected with Indian epigraphy and history that I venture to offer him the following remarks on a difficult problem in the hope that he will either assent to them or arrive at a more satisfactory solution." Sir M. N. Mookerjee, who, as President of the Indian Research Institute, formally presented the Volume to Dr. D. R. Bhandarkar, rightly admitted that the presentation ceremony reminded him of a similar occasion when a like Volume was presented to his revered and distinguished father the late Sir R. G. Bhandarkar about a quarter of a century ago by a galaxy of brilliant scholars, Indian and European. In that connection he was further reminded of the words which that great son of Bengal, the late Sir Asutosh Mookerjee, used when conferring on him the Honorary Degree of Ph.D. of the Calcutta University in 1921. The late Sir Asutosh Mookerjee said: "your bold and brilliant excursions into many an unknown tract of Ancient Indian History have furnished fresh evidence of the Law of Heredity," and "your colleagues rejoice to find in you not a chip of the old Block but the old Block itself."

In spite of the scholarship and research in which he has created a name for himself, a young scholar always receives from him encouragement, guidance in the right direction, and, above all, finds in him that absence of superiority complex which is noticeable unfortunately in some of our veteran Indian scholars. His valuable and well-arranged library is open to an enthusiastic and sincere worker who can derive much help and benefit from there.

Coming to the details of papers contributed to the Volume, they are almost all papers of outstanding merit in various branches of Indology, especially Archaeology and Ancient Indian History and Culture. Here however we may note that Profs. Heras and Raychaudhuri have tried to show the existence of a cult of Śiva and Mother Goddess in India and Western Asia, in two separate articles. Prof. Heras deals with an interesting seal from Harappa, which according to Sir John Marshall has the figure of the Mother Goddess. He however takes that figure to be one of God Śiva, the god of Fertility. And what was supposed by Sir John to be the plant issuing out from the womb of the Mother Goddess is taken by him as the God's *nīcamēdhra*, or 'hanging organ', a characteristic which has been mentioned in the Atharvaveda in connection with the Vrātya cult. According to Prof. Heras, prototypes of God Śiva were also found in Sumeria, Babylon and Crete. Prof. Raychaudhuri's contribution consists in the comparison of Śiva with Teshub of the Hittite pantheon who was associated with Mother Goddess actually called *Ma*. In the Kuṣāṇa period, I have recently shown, Śiva (Bhaveśa) was associated with NANA who has been identified by me with the Mother Goddess Ambā=Ambikā=Bhavānī. The Goddess NANA is also found in Western Asia and curiously enough this word was known even in the R̥gvedic period in the sense of 'Mother'. It therefore seems probable that there was some common cult of Mother Goddess

both in India and in Western Asia. It will thus be seen that Prof. Heras and Prof. Raychaudhuri have tried to throw light on the cult of Śiva and Mother Goddess from different angles of vision. This is a very interesting subject on which much work still remains to be done. For the present will some scholar find out if Teshub, Bes and Śiva had common origin?

In the realm of epigraphy Professors Sten Konow, Lüders and Nilakantha Sastri have made valuable contributions. Prof. Lüders' contention of the identification of the era of Mahārāja Rājātīrāja with the Parthian era of 247 B.C. is a most plausible one, and it appears that a full consideration of the subject can hardly leave two opinions on the point. Among the papers dealing with the history of Gujarat, Mr. C. D. Chatterjee's paper is highly stimulating. There are other good contributions on Early Mediaeval and Mediaeval History dealing with the Western Cālukyas, Guhilots and the Kalacuris as well as with Rājputānā and Delhi. Mention may also be made of the interesting papers by some notable Indian scholars, namely, Drs. Krishnaswami Aiyangar, R. C. Majumdar and B. M. Barua. But it would take us too long to take proper note of them in this review.

The chief Editor of this Volume is of course Dr. B. C. Law who has distinguished himself not only as a scholar of a high order but also as a competent Editor of the *Indian Culture* for a long time. The publication of this Volume like other monumental works is also due to his unstinted generosity. We are also very thankful to Mr. S. C. Seal, Honorary General Secretary of the Indian Research Institute, for originally thinking of having such a Volume at all, securing the co-operation of distinguished scholars as members of the Board of Editors, and making the publication of the Ācārya-puṣpāñjali a success.

BAIJ NATH PURI.

OLD PERSIAN INSCRIPTIONS of the Achaemenian emperors, by Dr. Sukumar Sen, M.A., Ph.D.; pp. 288; published by the University of Calcutta, 1941.

Dr. Sukumar Sen is to be congratulated on the publication of this very useful work, which, I am sure, will be used as a companion volume to Benveniste's *Grammaire du vieux-perse* by all interested in Iranian history and philology. All the Old Persian inscriptions discovered up to date will be found here collected in one handy volume. To make the work complete in this respect the author had to insert the "further inscriptions" published after the book as originally planned was already printed. For the same reason the author had to give supplementary addenda to the very valuable Glossary, but

the reader should note that these addenda have been inserted *before* the "Further Inscriptions." Those interested in the history of ancient Persia will find here the Achaemenian monarchs speaking to them directly in a language singularly like Sanskrit; and those interested in ancient Iranian culture will experience a pleasant surprise to find in the Daiva-inscription (discovered in 1935) a striking corroboration of the daring theory launched by Prof. Benveniste that in spite of Zarathuštra and his royal converts the religion of the Iranian *people* remained essentially Daivic. But Dr. Sen has planned his book specially for our students interested in philology. With this end in view he has given a Sanskrit *Chāyā*—even at the risk of coining new forms at every step—to every Old Persian text. Over and above this, every Old Persian word has been philologically analysed in the copious notes added to every inscription. On some points at least, more information would have been welcome in these notes. Regarding the anomalous form *miθra*, for instance, it should have been mentioned perhaps that the Elamite version presupposes the truly Persian form *missa*. A few words seem to have been missed in the Glossary and the Addenda thereto,—*haumavarkā* for instance, occurring in Naxš-i-Rustam a l. 25.—At the end Dr. Sen has also given an Outline of Old Persian Grammar. Due to enforced brevity no doubt, the rules could not always be given here in perfectly unambiguous form.

BATAKRISHNA GHOSH,

WOMEN IN R̥GVEDA by Bhagwat Saran Upadhyā, M.A., pp. 241, printed at the Benares Hindu University Press, 1941.

It is gratifying to see that this learned work has come out in a second edition eight years after the first. This shows that our countrymen have now learnt to take interest in the history of our national culture. The author has in the meantime completely rewritten the book, as he says in the preface. Unfortunately there are still too many mistakes and inaccuracies. I am not going to list here the mistakes in quoting and translating the texts, for that will be doing injustice to an author who does not claim to be a Sanskritist. But I cannot pass over in silence the cases in which through sheer inadvertence the author has landed himself in ugly errors. Author's elaborations on the word *devṛkāmā* is a case in point. Not content with widow-remarriage and levirate, he has calmly declared that after the death of her husband the wife "could not remain a widow even for a day" (p. 94), and he repeats the substance of this statement in a more piquant form on p. 97. But the fact is that the word *devṛkāmā* does not occur at all in the R̥gveda. In the passage (RV. X. 85. 44) referred to by Mr. Upadhyā in this connection I read only

devakāmā, and that in all the editions of the *R̥gveda* known to me. Oldenberg too in his *Textkritische und exegetische Noten* (Vol. II, p. 289) decided in favour of this reading. *R̥gvedic devakāmā* is in fact a fiction of Böhtlingk-Roth, accepted by generations of uncritical writers. But the funniest thing about it is that on p. 129 when translating the same passage ("loving the gods") our author had apparently the correct text in view! Mr. Upadhya takes the word *gartāruh* (this is the correct form, not *gartāruh*) to signify "other widows also led to be remarried" (p. 95); is it due to oversight that he has not tried to justify this translation? The *Dānastuti*-verse RV. I. 126. 7 has been completely misinterpreted on p. 61 (see Geldner's comments in his *Uebersetzung*). On this page Ghoshā has been called *rājñaduhitā*, but surely such a word is not possible in Sanskrit! In an astonishing digression the author has gone out of his way to support the theory of Dr. Pran Nath that "the *R̥gveda* in its origin is a Sumero-Egyptian document" (p. 125, f.n. 7). The author has repeatedly referred to a German book which he uniformly calls *Enturklungsstufen*!—In spite of these imperfections the book certainly repays perusal. Much in it is quite irrelevant: There was, for instance, no call for an elaborate analysis of the gambler's hymn.

BATAKRISHNA GHOSH.

VON DER SEELE DER INDISCHEN FRAU im Spiegel der Volkssprüche des Konkan, von Hedwig Bachmann, pp. X+467; Tipografia Rangel, Bastorá, India Portuesa, 1941.

The title of this book is really frightening to a mere man, but in reality it is quite a homely book. The authoress has tried to describe the social life in Western India in the light of Konkaneṣe proverbs. It is not at all an objective description of the daily life of the people. The object of the writer's enquiry is rather the *spirit* of the Indian people in general, and the *soul* of the Indian woman in particular, which latter, she thinks, is reflected in the Konkaneṣe proverbs she has studied. The whole book is nothing but a running commentary on these current proverbs. It reveals to us how the rural life in Western India strikes an intelligent and educated European lady neither claiming nor possessing any special knowledge of Indian culture, history or languages. The book is thus useful. All the proverbs given in it however do not reflect the true state of things either in ancient or in modern times,—for instance, the one quoted on p. 153: "the coloured woman belongs to her husband, but the white woman to everybody". The foreword written by Prof. W. H. Hoffmann is unworthy of this useful book.

BATAKRISHNA GHOSH,

INSCRIPTIONS DU CAMBODGE, éditées et traduites par G. Coedès, Vol. I, pp. 321; Hanoi, École Française d'Extrême-orient, 1937.

In this splendid volume M. Coedès has given the text and translation (with copious notes) of some of the particularly important inscriptions bearing on Cambodian history discovered since 1929. The Śaiva inscription of Phnom Prāṇ Vihār is a short Sanskrit one of nine verses eulogising King Bhavavarman who might be Bhavavarman I, the conqueror of Fou-nan, or Bhavavarman II who reigned in 561 A.D. Of the two inscriptions of Jayavarman I the first is of considerable historical importance, inasmuch as it mentions the Pallava kings of Kañcīpura; the second proves that Jayavarman I was still reigning in 673 A.D. The inscription on the stele of Praṇ Ko of the time of Indravarman (877 A.D.) records the installation of three statues of Śiva and three statues of Devī; there is perhaps also an allusion to the cult of Devarāja. The seventh verse of this inscription is worth quoting : प्रथमं लब्धराज्यो यः प्रतिज्ञां कृतवान्

इति । इतः पञ्चदिनाद्ध्वं प्रारप्स्ये खननादिकम् ॥

The inscription of Śivasoma, the guru of king Indravarman, is of the first importance, for Ś. says that he had learnt the Śāstra from the mouth of Bhagavat Śaṅkara himself; M. Coedès avers that this Śaṅkara might be the great Śaṅkarācārya.—A Subhāṣita with quadruple entendre may be found in the twenty-seventh verse of one of the new inscriptions of Koh Ker of the time of Jayavarman IV (p. 64): चन्द्रहासः

प्रियो यस्य प्रकाशो भुवनेष्वहो । तथा हि हस्ते हृदये कोट्यां सन्निहितो मुखे ॥ Here

candrahāsa=scimitar is in his *hand*; moon-like benevolence in his *heart*; his glory *mocks even the moon* which is imperfect in comparison; and of course his *face* rivals the moon in beauty.—The long inscription on the stele of Pre Rup (298 verses, tenth century) supplies many valuable data for cultural history, and specifically mentions the Atharvaveda, Rāmāyaṇa, Mahābhārata, Pāṇini, Raghuvamśa, and also the Buddhist doctrine of Yogācāra.—King Jayavarman V (967 A.D.) has been eulogised in the inscription of Bantay Srei (p. 150) in the following terms : पातञ्जल्ये काणादेऽक्षपादकपिलागमे । बौद्धे वैद्ये च गान्धर्वे ज्यौतिषे

नयते स्म यः ॥ आख्यायिकाकृतिरभूत् स्वदेशे यदुपक्रमम् । नानाभाषालिपिज्ञश्च प्रयोक्ता नाटकस्य यः ॥ He became famous as a poet also in foreign countries : काव्यैः सब्रितैर्दूरे नानाद्वीपान्तरस्थितान् ।

यः समुत्सुक्यामास विदुषः सज्जनानपि ॥ (verse 24).—The long inscription on the stele of Prasat Komphus of the age of Jayavarman V (972 A.D.) is poor in historical data but contains many pretty verses in typical Kāvya style, e.g. verse 34 :

विधूतखड्गप्रभयाद्विलम्बितो विपक्षवक्षःक्षतजारुणां श्रियम् । विलोक्य कीर्तिः कुपितेन दिग्द्रुता प्रियापि यस्य प्रययौ न सन्निधिम् ॥

The second of the two new inscriptions from Prasat Khna (pp. 197 ff.) is of the time of Udayādityavarman II and dated in the year Śaka 982=1060 A.D. It consists of 122 verses of indifferent quality offering hardly any new (historical data.—The inscription of the time of Harṣavarman III (pp. 222 ff.) dated in the Śaká year 987 is likewise a barren Praśasti.—The inscription (date 1189 or 1195 A.D.) on the stele of Prasat Tor (pp. 227 ff.) is a miniature Kāvya in 61 verses bristling with cheap alliterations, e.g. दोर्दण्डदण्डदलितद्विरदेन्द्रदन्तक्षोभैः etc. (verse 19). The author of this inscription was the grandson of a Brahmin dignitary who served successively under three Buddhist kings.—The other inscriptions given in this volume though highly interesting in many respects are not so important for the political and cultural history of Cambodge as the ones mentioned above.

It is impossible to do adequate justice to a work like this in a short review. M. Coedès, as also the École Française d'Extrême-orient which has done so much to recover the forgotten history of Greater India, has won the gratitude of all Indians by publishing in such exemplary fashion the newly discovered inscriptions of Cambodge. I hope Indian historians will not fail to pay the book the respectful attention it deserves.

BATAKRISHNA GHOSH.

IMPORTANT CONTRIBUTIONS TO ORIENTAL JOURNALS

Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Vol. XXI, Parts III-IV, 1941.

"Asura Varuṇa" by R. N. Dandekar.—Author rejects the equation Varuṇa = Ouranos, and neither does he accept the Moon-theory of Oldenberg and Hillebrandt. Starting with the assumption that Güntert was right in connecting Mi-tra with *mc-khalā* he comes to the conclusion that Varuṇa represents "the conception of the world-sovereign" and that "the rivalry between Indra and Varuṇa would give us the necessary starting point for the discussion of how the world-sovereign... was transformed into the god of ocean."

The Buddhistic Conception of Dharma by P. T. Raju.—Excellent treatment of a very difficult subject. Author's conclusions, apparently reached independently, are very like those of Rosenberg, *Die Probleme der buddhistischen Philosophie*, Heidelberg 1924.

Ancient Indian Tribes by B. C. Law.—Author has here collected material about the Kalingas, Kulaṭas, Ramaṭhas and Pāradas.

Regional and Dynastic Study of South Indian Monuments by H. D. Sankalia.—Author raises, *inter alia*, the question whether the underlying regional difference is due to the fact that Bhakti-cult in Śaivism developed late in the eastern part of S. India.

Paget's Gesture-theory of the Origin of Human Speech by C. R. Sankaran.—Author has indulged in much unorthodox glottogonical speculation in presenting Paget's "fascinating theory".

Chronology of the Works of Mahīdhara by P. K. Gode.—Author shows that Dr. Sarup was wrong in assigning to the 12th century the commentator Mahīdhara who "flourished between A.D. 1530 and 1610 or so."

Vedic Lozes by Hiralal Amritlal Shah.—Author is of opinion that the three wheels of the Aśvins' Car (RV. X. 85. 14) are the three stars of the Constellation Aśvinī.

A Controverted Reading in Meghadūta by Hiralal Amritlal Shah.—Author finds support for the reading *praśamadivase* in the expression "*parīṇata-śaraccandrikāsu kṣapāsu*."

Racial Origin of Nambudri Brahmans by K. R. Chatterjee.—"The Nambudris migrated from north India with the republican Āyudhajivin constitution and settled in the south."

Rāvaṇa's Laṅkā by Daniel John.—"Rāvaṇa's Laṅkā was not on the Vindhya Ranges but on an island in the midst of the sea off the Southern or South-eastern coast of the Island of Ceylon."

Mahābhārata Notes by Vasudeva S. Agarwala.—Interesting comments on *vāraṇau śaṣṭihāyanau* (Virāṭa-p. 12. 20), *vaiyāghra* (Sabhā-p. 51. 34), *upasṛtāḥ* (Vana-p. 240. 5), *harṇa* (Ādi-p., Crit. Ed., p. 36), and the story of Yavakṛita (Vana-p., chs. 133-38).

Annals of Oriental Research, University of Madras, Vol. V, Part 1, 1940-41.

Place-name Suffixes in Tamil by R. P. Sethu Pillai.

Aḷpeḍai (lengthening of the quantity of a letter) [in Tamil] by V. Venkata Rajulu Reddiar.

Telugu Literature Outside the Telugu Country by K. Ramakrishnaiya.—A Brief Historical Survey from the Earliest Times to the Present Day.

Ancient Kerala by C. Achyuta Menon.—Presidential address delivered at the Malayalam Section of the All India Oriental Conference held at Tirupathi, March 1940. Superficial.

Vyavahāraśiromaṇi of Nārāyaṇa [a pupil of Vijñāneśvara] edited by T. R. Chintamani.—The only manuscript, from which this important Nibandha has been edited here, breaks off in the middle of the Dāyabhāga section.

Arab Maritime Enterprise by S. Muhammad Husayn Nainar.—"The Arabs' knowledge of the oceans may be inadequate, yet they had a clear idea of the Eastern Seas."

Arabic and Persian Words in the Tamil Language by S. Muhammad Husayn Nainar.—"Even before the birth of Islam in Arabia, the Tamil language had already been influenced by Arabic contact."

Tattvaśuddhi edited by S. S. Suryanarayana Sastri and E. P. Radhakrishnan.—This instalment contains the following chapters:—Bhedanirākaraṇam, Asatkāryavādanirākaraṇam, Kṣaṇabhaṅgavādanirākaraṇam, Bheda-bheda-nirāsaḥ, Dehātma-vādanirākaraṇam, Vijñānavādanirākaraṇam and Saṁsāramithyātvaṁ.

The Aryan Path, March-April 1941.

Hindu Epistemology and Modern Thought by V. R. Talasikar.—"An intellectual understanding of the working of the Universe or the construction of the fabric of the Universe on the strength of metaphysical speculation has never been regarded in Hindu Philosophy as Right Knowledge." What about Sāṅkhya?

The Upanishada Ideals of Education by Matilal Das.—A rather common-place sermon on the famous passage of the Taittiriya Upaniṣad.

Bergson and Saṅkara by P. Nagaraja Rao.—Though Bergson does not believe in anything transcending both matter and mind, yet the author finds some plausible affinity between Bergson's philosophy and Saṅkara's.

The Miracle of Sikhism by Jogendra Singh.—Not very helpful.

The Asiatic Review, April 1941.

The Elements of Malayan Civilization by Sir Richard Winstedt.—“Hinduism in all its forms was centred at novel courts. . . . The divine right of rajas who had to be addressed in a special vocabulary full of Sanskrit words, an embryo caste system. . . . all these innovations were of Indian origin. . . . Islam with all its intolerance failed to oust Sanskrit terms for “religion”, “teacher”, “heaven”, “hell”. . . . The Hindu period of Malay civilization. . . . was started early in the Christian era by the coming of Pallava immigrants to Kedah and Perak.”

Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême-orient, Tome XL, Fasc. 1, 1940.

Dictionnaire tay blanc français par Georges Minot.—A valuable dictionary of the chief Siamese dialect.

Bulletin of the Deccan College Research Institute, Vol. I, Nos. 1-4; Vol. II, Nos. 1-2.

Epic Questions by V. S. Sukthankar.—Author has effectively defended the reading *hāsyarūpeṇa* instead of *hamsarūpeṇa* in Mbh. (Crit. Ed.) 1. 57. 21.

Apropos Epic *iyāt* by S. M. Katre.—Author discusses the use of some optative forms in preterital sense.

The Ṛg-veda Mantras in their ritual setting in the Gṛhya Sūtras by V. M. Apte.—It is hardly an exaggeration to say that the author by this work has opened up a new field of research. By a close examination of the Ṛk-mantras in the Āśvalāyana Gṛhyasūtra Mr. Apte has proved that the mantras on the whole were appropriate to the occasions on which they were used and therefore could not have been regarded as mere magical formulas charged with mysterious potency.

XVIIth Century Gold-gilt Copper-board Inscriptions and Sculptures from Nepal by H. D. Sankalia.—“It is perhaps the first time that ‘bronzes’ of all the Five Dhyānī Buddhas from Nepāl are brought to light.”

Reduplicatives in Indo-Aryan by S. M. Katre.—Advance specimen of a comprehensive work on the subject,

• Absolutives in the Critical Edition of the Virāṭaparvan by M. A. Mehendale.
—Author has pointed out a large number of irregular absolutives including a case of *grhya* (occurring in the oft-quoted verse *sandhyāvadhūm* etc. attributed to Pāṇini).

Some Important Personalities of Baghdād (during the latter half of the 4th and the earlier quarter of the 5th centuries of Islām) by C. H. Shaikh.
Some Folk-songs of Maharashtra by Irawati Karvé.

Reconstruction of the Proto-Dravidian Pronouns by C. R. Sankaran.—
Highly speculative.

François Martin by R. G. Harshe.—Romantic life of “the real founder of the French Dominions in India.”

The Geographical Factors in the History of Mahārāṣṭra by T. S. Shejwalkar.—Excellent geo-political study.

Indo-Arica I by S. M. Kartc.—Discussion of Skt. *ūrṇāvābhi* and AMāg. *caḍagara*.

Jaina Yakṣas and Yakṣiṇīs by H. D. Sankalia.—This paper “is only a step [in the direction of archaeologically studying Jaina Yakṣas and Yakṣiṇīs] including figures from the Prince of Wales Museum, Bombay, the Jaina temple at Aihole, Jaina Cave at Bādāmi, those reported from a temple at Deogarh in Central India, and one from Patan in Northern Gujarat.”

The Ambarnāth Temple by H. D. Sankalia and A. V. Naik.—Authors aver that this temple might have been an immediate source of inspiration to the Śīlahāras and the Yādavas.

Megalithic Monuments near Poona by H. D. Sankalia.

The so-called Buddhist Images from the Baroda State by H. D. Sankalia.—
Author shows that these are Jaina images and not Buddhist at all.

Ṭākkī or Ḍhakkī by M. A. Mehendale.—Attempt at reconstructing the grammar of this dialect from the speeches of Māthura and Dyūtakara in the second act of Mṛcchakaṭika. “Ṭākkī is a Romani or Gypsy dialect spoken somewhere in India, either in North-West Panjab or in Orissa.”

The Roots of the Pāli Dhātupāṭhas by S. M. Katre.—This list is based on the *Dhātupāṭha* and *Dhātumañjūsā* edited by Dines Andersen and Helmer Smith and the second section of *Saddanīti* edited by Helmer Smith. Author says: “the full significance of this list will become clear in my forthcoming work *Materials for a Dhātupāṭha of Indo-Āryan*.”

Case Variations in the Critical Edition of the Mahābhārata,—the Dative and its variants by E. D. Kulkarni.—An excellent idea carried out conscientiously after the fashion of Edgerton's *Vedic Variants*.

Kinship Terminology and Kinship Usages of the Marāṭhā Country by Irawati Karvé.—Thorough and exhaustive.

The Dravidian (Tamil) *Atta-* and *Annai* in Hittite by C. R. Sankaran.—Altogether too daring.

A Textual Criticism of the Āśvalāyana Gṛhya Sūtra by V. M. Apte.—Based upon the non-inclusion in the Āśvalāyana-mantrasamhitā of some Ṛgvedic Mantras cited in the Āśvalāyana Gṛhyasūtra.

Were Castes formulated in the Age of the Ṛgveda? by V. M. Apte.—In author's opinion, caste was not formulated in India,—“the Ṛgvedic Aryans came with the fourfold division into India.”

Studies in Nāgārjunakoṇḍā Sculptures by A. V. Naik.—Detailed study of dress and ornaments.

A Further Note on Ṭākkī by M. A. Mehendale.—Here is given the material from a Kaṭavaka of the *Harivaṃśapurāṇa* which, according to its author, is written in Ḍhakka-bhāṣā.

The Śrauta Counterpart of the Godāna Ceremony by C. S. Venkateswaran. A Note on the ‘Ābhīras’ in Patañjali by D. G. Bhawe.

The Cultural and Social Conditions as Reflected in the Similes of the Dawn-hymns in the Ṛgveda by P. K. Narayana Pillai.

Gupta Inscriptions and the Purāṇic Tradition by D. R. Patil.—Author has tried to reconstruct part of Guptan tradition “by corroborating the inscriptural hints from the unanimous tradition of the Purāṇas.”

Contributions on Indo-European Accent by C. R. Sankaran.—Survey of current theories on the subject. Not very lucid.

The Calcutta Review, February—March—April, 1941.

The Modern Age in India by S. N. Sen.—Presidential address, Modern Indian History Section, Indian History Congress, 1940.

An Enquiry into Idealism in Hindu Marriage by Krishnagopal Goswami.

Epigraphia Indica, Vol. XXV, Parts VI-VII, April—July, 1940.

Charala Plates of Vīrarājendravēda (Śaka 991) by A. S. Ramanatha Ayyar and V. Venkatasubba Ayyar.—This is the first copper-plate charter of this Cola king and is of great help in filling up the lacunae in the Kanyākumārī record (EI. XVIII, pp. 21 ff.) of the same king. Political and military career of Vīrarājendra has been fully discussed by the editors.

Date of the Pāṇḍava Kings of Southern Kosala by A. Ghosh.—Author has tried to show that these kings cannot be dated so early as the sixth century A.D.

Nilagangavaram Inscription of Ambadeva-Mahārāja (Śaka 1212) by R. S. Panchmukhi.—In the introductory portion it is said that the Kṣatriyas

who survived the havoc made by Paraśurāma came to be called Kāyasthas. "The Kāyasthas were a powerful family of feudatory chiefs who played a prominent part in the politics of the mediaeval period in the Telugu country."

Bargaon Temple Inscription of Śabara by V. V. Mirāshi.—"If the identification of the illustrious Śabara of the present inscription with the Śabara chief slain by Kṛṣṇarāja's minister is accepted, the Śabara chief can be referred to the third quarter of the 10th century A.D."

Jirjingi Plates of Gaṅga Indravarman by R. K. Ghoshal.—Dated in the year 39 (of the Gaṅga era ?), "it is the earliest inscription of the Eastern Gaṅga kings discovered so far."

Poona Plates of Chālukya Vinayāditya (Śaka 612) by Madho Sarup Vats.—Records gift of land at the request of the queen to two Brāhmaṇas "for the merit accruing from the gift of a girl in marriage (*kanyādharṇīmārtham*)."

Anjaneri Plates of Gurjara Jayabhṭa III (710 A.D.) by Madho Sarup Vats and D. B. Diskalkar.—The beneficiary of this grant was a Brāhmaṇa named Nārāyaṇa, son of Vasusvāmin of Dābhilya gotra and Chanoga-Kauthuma Śākhā.

The Punjai Inscription of Kṛṣṇadevarāya by Nilakantha Sastri.—This epigraph (date 1517 A.D.) is a copy of an order issued by King Kṛṣṇadevarāya of Vijayanagara while he was camping on the banks of the river Kṛṣṇavenī some time after his conquest of the Kālīṅga Country.

Jubbulpore Stone Inscription of Vimalaśiva: the Kalachuri year 926 by V. V. Mirāshi.—"The importance of the present inscription lies in the information it furnishes about the spiritual preceptors of the Kalachuri kings of Tripurī."

Conjeeveram Inscription of Brahma-tantra-svatantra-Jīyar (Śaka 1282) by A. S. Ramanatha Ayyar.—The inscription is worded as if it is issued by the deity himself. Brahmatantrasvatantra was a direct disciple of Vedānta-Deśika. This epigraph refers to a collection of manuscripts which was kept in the *maṭha* and a stipulation made for its proper upkeep.

Kāśyapa Image Inscription from Silao by B. Ch. Chhabra.—The Kāśyapa mentioned in this ninth century inscription is no other than the Mahā-Kāśyapa who is reputed to have convened the First Buddhist Council. The find-spot corresponds to the place where, according to the Aṭṭhakathās, Kāśyapa first met the Buddha.

A Bronze Image Inscription from Nālandā by A. Ghosh.—The inscription shows that a *haṭṭa* was founded at Nālandā by Devapāla.

A Note on the Pañchādhārālā Pillar Inscription of King Viśveśvara by M. Somanekhara Sarma.—"The date should be corrected to Śaka 1324."

The Indian Historical Quarterly, Vol. XVII, No. 1, March, 1941.

Cirañjīva and his Patron Yaśavanta Simha by Dinesh Chandra Bhattacharyya.

The Cālukyās of Kalyāṇi (Taila II, 973-97 A.D.) by S. L. Katare.

The Talpurs of Sind by Mohammad Yasin.

The North-West Frontier of the Sultanate during the 13th Century by U. N. Day.

Somatism of Vedic Psychology by R. N. Dandekar.

Defence of Patna against the Pindari Incursion of 1812 by Kalipada Mitra.

Guṇapātākā (an unknown Sanskrit work and its date—before A.D. 1200) by P. K. Gode.

A Linguistic Note on the Muṇḍaka Upaniṣad by Vidhusekhara Bhattacharyya.—A number of grammatical “irregularities” have been discussed.

The Muslim Conquest of Bengal by N. B. Roy.—Lakṣmaṇasena made a brave stand according to Isami (1350 A.D.) the author of *Futuh-us-salāṭīn*.

Kṛṣṇa Deva Rāya's Economic Policy by Y. Venkataramana.

Epithets of an Arhat in the Divyāvadāna by E. J. Thomas.

Date of the earliest Sanskrit Inscription of Campā by Dines Chandra Sircar.—Author defends his position that the date 2nd or 3rd century A.D. would be too early for the Vo-cañh inscription.

The Vatsagulma Copper-plate Grant of King Vindhyaśakti II by Dines Chandra Sircar.—Text and translation.

Date of the Kalacuri Kokkala I by Khushal Chandra Vatsalya Jain.—“Kokkala I ruled between c. 840 and 885 A.D.”

The Sūtrasamuccaya by Anukulchandra Banerjee.—“There were two texts of *Sūtrasamuccaya*—one by Śāntideva and the other by Nāgārjuna.”

Journal of the American Oriental Society, Vol. 61, No. 1, March 1941.

The Faithful Dog as Security for a Debt : A Companion to the Brahman and the Mongoose Story-type by M. B. Emeneau.—Thirteen Indian versions of the story have been given here.

The Vocalism of Sino-Tibetan by Robert Shafer.

The Voiced Sibilants in Sanskrit by Gordon H. Marsh.—Brief but thorough. Almost all the forms concerned have been discussed.

Journal of the Annamalai University, Vol. X, No. 3, March 1941.

The Nayaks of Tanjore (contd. from previous issue) by V. Vridhagirisan.
Studies in Sanskrit Texts on Temple Architecture with Special Reference to the Tantrasamuccaya by N. V. Mallaya.

Bhāvanāviveka with Viṣamagranthikabhedikā by V. A. Ramaswami Sastri and K. A. Sivaramakrishna Sastri.

Prameyamālā by R. Ramanujachariar and K. Srinivasachariar.

Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society, Vol. XXVII, Part I, March 1941.

The Wall-paintings of Ajanta by G. Yazdani.—A vastly entertaining and instructive lecture. "We find that the art of painting was considerably developed in the second century B.C."

The Rise of the Rajputs by Bhupendra Nath Datta.—Ethnological study. Identification of a Sculpture in the Provincial Museum, Lucknow, by D. P. Pandey.—Author proposes to identify the images as Balarāma, Rukmiṇī and Vāsudeva-Kṛṣṇa.

The Jñānasvarodaya of Dariyā Sāhab by Dharmendra Brahmachari Sastri.

The Journal of the Greater India Society, Vol. VII, No. 1, January 1941.

Recent Progress in Malayan Archaeology by K. A. N. Sastri.

Theravāda Buddhism in Burma by Nihar Ranjan Ray.

Journal of the Gujarat Research Society, Vol. III, No. 2, April 1941.

The Early Mediaeval Temples of Gujarat and Treatises on Architecture by H. D. Sankalia.

Journal of Indian History, Vol. XX, Pt. 1, April 1941.

Identification of 'Indraratha of Ādinagara' found in Tirumalai Inscriptions of Rajendra Chola I by P. Acharya.

The First two Anglo-Mysore Wars and Economic Drain on Bengal by Kalikinkar Datta.

The Mogul Family and the Court in 19th Century Delhi by T. G. P. Spear.—A revolting picture.

Some tribes of Ancient India by Bimala Churn Law.—Author has discussed the Mūṣikas, Māhiṣakas, Bhṛgukacchas, Tosalas, Gajāhvayas, Parnasavaras, Kaṅkanas and Aparāntas.

The Gupta Era by Dharendra Nath Mookerjee.—Author has tried to show that "astronomical verifications support the fact that the era introduced by the Gupta Vikramādityas is identical with the well-known Vikrama era."

Jain Religious Orders in the Kuṣāṇa Period by Baij Nath Puri.
 Gangu Bahmaṇi by H. K. Sherwani.—“The word Bahman has absolutely no connection with Brahmans and only reminded the King of his Zoroastrian origin.”
 Timur Shah's Army in 1793 by Hari Ram Gupta.
 Last Days of Guru Govind Singh by Ganda Singh
 Peshwa Madhav Rao I's Last Carnatic Expedition by Anilchandra Banerjee.
 Partition of Sirhind Province by the Sikhs, January 1764 by Hari Ram Gupta.

Journal of the Malay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, Vol. XIX, Part II, February 1941.

An Introduction to the Study of Ancient Times in the Malay Peninsula and the Straits of Malacca by Roland Braddell.—Contd. from Vol. XVII, Pt. 1, pp. 146-212.

The Journal of the Polynesian Society, Vol. 50, No. 1, March 1941.

Melanesian Modes of Speech by W. G. Ivens.—Concluded.

Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal, Letters, Vol. VI, 1940, No. 2.

Survivals of the Indus Culture by M. E. and D. H. Gordon.—An attempt to bridge up archaeologically the apparent gulf between the Indus Culture and the Early Historical Period.

The Ancient Workers of Western Dhalbhum by E. F. O. Murray.
 Panegyric of Malaivamma by Chintaharan Chakravarti.—Tantric Yantras are the main theme of this panegyric!

The Journal of the Sind Historical Society, Vol. V, No. 2, June 1941.

Studies in Indo-Muslim History by Hodivala.—Critical comments on Elliot's History of India, Vol. 1, pp. 300 to 326.

The Sassanians in Sind by N. M. Billimoria.—Unscientific.

The Iranians in Ancient India by N. M. Billimoria.—Superficial.

Man in India, Vol. XXI, No. 1, January-March 1941.

The Sun as a Folk-god by Nanimadhab Chaudhuri.—“Certain features of folk worship of the sun have persisted from the early Vedic times to the present day.”

Hydroselenic [as opposed to Helio-lithic] Culture by Srikantha Sastri.

New Indian Antiquary Vol. III, Nos. 11-12 and Vol. IV, No. 1, February-March-April 1941.

Eighteenth-century Malayālam Prose written by Christians by L. V. Ramaswami Aiyar.

Inscriptions of Kathiawad by D. B. Diskalkar.

The Epoch of the Gupta Era by K. G. Sankar.—After an examination of the astronomical data in the inscriptions the author comes to the conclusion that “273 A.C. must therefore be the true epoch of the Gupta era.”

On the Study and Metrology of Silver Punch-marked Coins by D. D. Kosambi.—Incomprehensible for the most part. Very learned.

The Hun Invasion of Hindusthān by K. G. Sankar.—In this thought-provoking article author has tried to explode “the myth of Hun invasion.” “Yaśodharman and Bālāditya defeated two different Mihirakulas,” “the Huns invaded Hindusthān in Gupta Year 136 but were decidedly defeated by Skandagupta and never ruled east of the Indus,” “Toramāṇa and Mihirakula were not Huns but Parthians or Kshattriyas.”

CORRECTION.

The last two lines of footnote 27a, p. 412, should be read “that Govindapāla’s *atīta-rājya* years should be regarded as his regnal years continued even after he had lost his kingdom.”

NOTICE

The Plate accompanying the paper “Pāikpārā Vāsudeva Image Inscription of King Govindacandra of Bengal” will appear in the next issue.

Thus difference of longitude of the planet (for the difference of terrestrial longitude of the prime meridian and the observer's position)

$$= \text{daily motion of planet} \times \frac{\angle A'CO}{360^\circ}$$

$$= \text{daily motion of planet} \times \frac{\text{arc } A'O}{\text{circle } A'OM}$$

$$= \text{daily motion of planet} \times \frac{\text{arc } LK}{\text{circle } ELKQ}$$

The *yojanas* of the difference of longitude of the observer from the prime meridian is to be measured on the Equator if its circumference is known in *yojanas*, or on the parallel of latitude if its circumference is known in *yojanas*.

(3) According to the text, if the daily motion of the planet is x degrees; and y *yojanas* the difference in terrestrial longitude, the correction for such difference in longitude is $y.x/60$ *liptās*. This is to be subtracted from the mean position of the planet as found, if the place be east of the prime meridian, and is to be added if the place is west.

The formula may be written as :

$$\text{deśāntara correction} = y.x \text{ minutes} / 3600,$$

which is based on the proportion :

$$\frac{\text{deśāntara correction in liptās}}{x \text{ liptās (minutes)}} = \frac{y \text{ yojanas}}{3,600 \text{ yojanas}}$$

and y *yojanas* are to be measured on the same circle of the earth whose circumference is 3,600 *yojanas* (either the Equator or the small circle at the observer's position parallel to the Equator) to determine the distance between the intercepts of the observer's meridian and the prime meridian. If the Equator be taken as 3,600 *yojanas*, y *yojanas* must also be measured on the Equator ; and, if 3,600 *yojanas* be the measure of the small circle at the observer's position parallel to the Equator, y *yojanas* must also be measured on this small circle.

According to *Āryyabhaṭa*, the earth's diameter is 1,050 *yojanas*, and the ratio of the circumference to the diameter of a circle is 62,832/20,000 ; and therefore the earth's circumference would be 3,298.68 *yojanas*. The earth's circumference at the Equator seems to have been taken by *Muñjāla* as 3,600 *yojanas*.

According to *Mahābhāskarīya*, VII, 22 (See Sen Gupta, Introduction to *Khaṇḍakhādya*, p. xv), *Brāhmasphuṭasiddhānta*, *Sūryya-*

siddhānta, I, 59, *Siddhānta-śekhara*, and *Siddhānta Śiromaṇī*, the diameter of the earth is 1,600 *yojanas*. According to *Sūryya-siddhānta*, the square root of ten times the square of that is the earth's circumference. According to *Bhāskara*, the earth's circumference is 4,967 *yojanas*. According to *Yallaya*, a commentator of *Laghumānasa*, it is 4,800 *yojanas*.

Pañcasiddhāntikā, XIII, vv. 15–16, define a degree of the earth's circumference to be equal to $(9 - \frac{1}{3})$ *yojanas*, or $90^\circ = 800$ *yojanas*; and the circumference = 3200 *yojanas*.

The corrected circumference of the earth at the observer's latitude is the equatorial circumference multiplied by the sine of the co-latitude of the observer's position (*Sūryya-siddhānta*, I, 60).

(4) The text of the verse given above follows the commentary of *Parameśvara* and some other manuscripts. *Praśastidhara's* commentary gives a variation of the second line of the verse as

ग्रहगत्यंशषष्ट्यंशाः हता लिप्ता ऋणं धनम्

(*grahagatyamśaṣaṣṭyamśāḥ hata liptā ṛṇam dhanam*). The significance is the same as before.

But, *Yallaya*, the commentator, gives quite a different reading of the second line, which alters the meaning. It is हता भुक्तिः स्वखाष्टान्विहता लिप्तास्वृणं धनम् (*hatā bhuktiḥ khakhāstābdhi-hṛtā liptāsvṛṇam dhanam*). According to *Yallaya*, therefore, the *deśāntara* correction = distance in *yojanas* of the observer's position from the prime meridian \times daily motion of the planet/4,800 *yojanas*. Here 4,800 *yojanas* is evidently the equatorial circumference and the distance of the observer from the prime meridian is also measured in *yojanas* on the equatorial circumference.

(5) Illustration.—At Kashmere the difference in longitude being 99 *yojanas* east, and the true motion of the sun being $61' 18''$, the *deśāntara* correction = $\frac{61' 18'' \times 99}{3,600}$ *liptās* = $1' 41''$. Deducting this from the sun's longitude $8^s 19^\circ 33'$, the correct longitude at the place of observation is $8^s 19^\circ 31' 19''$.

† To determine *tithi*, *karana*, *nakṣatra* and *yoga* —

व्यकन्दुस्तिथितिर्यर्थे ग्रहाद्भान्यनुपाततः ।

योगश्चन्द्रार्कसंयोगात् तदाद्यन्तौ स्वभुक्तिः ॥ २१ ॥

vyarkendustithitithyardhe grahādbhānyanupātatah |
yogaścandrārkaśamyogāt tadādyantau svabhuktitah || 21 ||

21. The difference of the positions (longitudes) of the moon and the sun gives *tithis* and *half-tithis* (*karaṇas*); the (position or longitude of the true) planet gives the *nakṣatra*; the sum of the longitudes of the sun and the moon gives *yogas*; all these are obtained by proportion; the beginnings and the ends of each of these (*tithi*, *karaṇa*, *nakṣatra* and *yoga*) are determined from the motions of the respective planets by proportion.

Notes.—(1) The period between two consecutive New Moons is called a lunation or lunar month, and is divided into 30 parts called *tithis*. The moon has a quicker motion eastwards amongst the stars than the sun; starting from the new moon when they have the same longitude, the moon gains on the sun every day, and when it gains 360 degrees on the sun, or when the longitudes of the sun and the moon are again equal, we get the next new moon. Instead of dividing the lunation into 30 equal *tithis*, the difference of longitudes of the moon and the sun, namely 360 degrees, between two consecutive lunations is divided into 30 equal parts of 12 degrees each, and the period during which the moon gains 12 degrees on the sun in longitude is more correctly defined to be a *tithi*. But, as the true motions of the sun and the moon are not uniform, 12 degrees' difference of their longitudes will be attained in different intervals at different periods; and thus all *tithis* are not of equal duration.

Thus, to find the number of elapsed *tithis* from any new moon, we have to divide the difference of longitudes of the sun and the moon in degrees by 12; the quotient gives the whole number of *tithis* elapsed; if "r" be the remainder, $r/12$ gives the portion of the current *tithi* elapsed (*gata*), and $1 - r/12$ gives the portion of the current *tithi* to be elapsed (*aiśya*).

The commencement of the current *tithi* is obtained by dividing $r/12$ by the difference of the true daily motions of the sun and the moon on the day; and the end of the *tithi* is calculated by dividing $1 - r/12$ by that difference.

(2) Each *tithi* is divided into two *karaṇas*, and thus in a lunation of 30 *tithis* there are 60 *karaṇas*. According to *Khaṇḍa-khāḍya-ka*, I, 26, and *Sūryya-siddhānta*, II, 67–69, the second half of the 14th *tithi* of the dark half of the month is called *śakuni karaṇa*, the first half of the 15th *catuṣpada karaṇa*, the second half is called *nāga karaṇa*, and the first half of the first *tithi* of the light half is called

kingstughna karaṇa. After *kingstughna* come the seven *karaṇas*, named *vava*, *vālava*, *kaulava*, *taitila*, *gara*, *vaṇij* and *viṣṭi*. These movable *karaṇas* are repeated and complete eight complete cycles up to the first half of the 14th *tithi* of the dark half of the month, after which we have the four fixed *karaṇas* stated above (Sen. Gupta, *Khaṇḍa-khādyaka*, p. 30).

The names of the *Karaṇas*, and the numbers of the half lunar days to which each is applied, are given below (See Burgess, Notes under v. 69 of *Sūryya Siddhānta*, Chapter II, True Places of the Planets):—

Names of Karaṇas	Corresponding Half Lunar Days
1. <i>Kingstughna</i>	1st
2. <i>Vava</i>	2nd, 9th, 16th, 23rd, 30th, 37th, 44th, 51st
3. <i>Vālava</i>	3rd, 10th, 17th, 24th, 31st, 38th, 45th, 52nd
4. <i>Kaulava</i>	4th, 11th, 18th, 25th, 32nd, 39th, 46th, 53rd
5. <i>Taitila</i>	5th, 12th, 19th, 26th, 33rd, 40th, 47th, 54th
6. <i>Gara</i>	6th, 13th, 20th, 27th, 34th, 41st, 48th, 55th
7. <i>Vaṇij</i>	7th, 14th, 21st, 28th, 35th, 42nd, 49th, 56th
8. <i>Viṣṭi</i>	8th, 15th, 22nd, 29th, 36th, 43rd, 50th, 57th
9. <i>Śakuni</i>	58th
10. <i>Nāga</i>	59th
11. <i>Catuṣpada</i>	60th

The commencement and the end of a *karaṇa* are to be found as in the case of a *tithi* explained above.

(3) If the longitude of a planet were expressed in terms of *nakṣatras* and its parts (as in *Vedāṅga Jyotiṣa*), it would at once show the number of *nakṣatras* and its parts that the planet has moved through and also the part remaining of the current *nakṣatra*.

But as the longitude of a planet is expressed in signs, degrees and minutes, it is to be reduced to *nakṣatras* by dividing by $13^{\circ} 20'$ or $800'$ (i.e. 360 degrees/ 27 *nakṣatras*). The 27 *nakṣatras* are *Aświnī*, *Bharanī*, *Kṛttikā*, *Rohinī*, *Mṛgaśīrā*, *Ārdrā*, *Punarvasu*, *Puṣyā*, *Aśleṣa*, *Maghā*, *Pūrva-Phālgunī*, *Uttara-Phālgunī*, *Hastā*, *Citrā*, *Swātī*, *Viśākhā*, *Anurādhā*, *Jyesthā*, *Mūla*, *Pūrvaṣāḍā*, *Uttaraṣāḍā*, *Śravaṇā*, *Dhanisthā*, *Śatabhiṣā*, *Pūrva-Bhādrapada*, *Uttara-Bhādrapada* and *Revatī*. For a description, identification, and other details about these

nakṣatras, see Sen Gupta, *Khaṇḍakhādyaka*, pp. 150-151 and Burgess, Translation of *Sūryya-Siddhānta*, Ch. VIII.

The commencement and the end of a *nakṣatra* of a planet is determined as before.

(4) When the sum of the longitudes of the sun and the moon is equal to half a circle (180 degrees) or the whole circle (360 degrees), it is respectively called *vyatipāta* or *vaidhṛta*; the days (whether elapsed or to come) are obtained from the excess or defect of the sum (of the sun and the moon) from 6 signs or 12 signs, divided by the sum of their daily motions; the *pāta*, whether *vyatipāta* or *vaidhṛta*, takes place when the sun and the moon have the same declinations (numerically) (See Sen Gupta, *Khaṇḍakhādyaka*, I, 28).

Compare *Āryyabhāṭa*, *Kālakriyāpāda*, 3 :

रविशशि नक्षत्रगणाः संमिश्राश्च व्यतीपाताः

(*raviśaśinakṣatraganāṣaṁmiśrāśca vyatipātāh*).

(5) From *Sūryya Siddhānta*, II, 65, however, and Burgess's Notes, a *yoga* is the period, of variable length, during which the joint-motion in longitude of the sun and the moon amounts to 360 deg./27, there being thus altogether 27 *yogas*. The names of the 27 *yogas* are as follows :—

1. <i>Viṣkambha</i>	10. <i>Gaṇḍa</i>	19. <i>Parigha</i>
2. <i>Prīṭi</i>	11. <i>Vṛddhi</i>	20. <i>Siva</i>
3. <i>Āyusmant</i>	12. <i>Dhruva</i>	22. <i>Sādhya</i>
4. <i>Saubhāgya</i>	13. <i>Vyāghāta</i>	21. <i>Siddha</i>
5. <i>Śobhana</i>	14. <i>Harṣaṇa</i>	23. <i>Śubha</i>
6. <i>Atigaṇḍa</i>	15. <i>Vajra</i>	24. <i>Śukla</i>
7. <i>Sukarman</i>	16. <i>Siddhi</i>	25. <i>Brahman</i>
8. <i>Dhṛti</i>	17. <i>Vyatipāta</i>	26. <i>Indra</i>
9. <i>Śūla</i>	18. <i>Varīyas</i>	27. <i>Vaidhṛti</i>

There is also in use in India another system of *yogas*, twenty-eight in number, having for the most part different names from these, and governed by other rules in their succession.

The commencement and the end of a *yoga* are determined as before.

(6) Illustration.—

True longitude of the moon	8 ^s 18° 2'
True longitude of the sun	8 ^s 19° 31'
Difference of Longitudes	11 ^s 28° 31' or 21, 511'

Dividing by 12 degrees or 720'

we get 29 *tithis* elapsed, and, of the current *tithi*, 631/720 parts elapsed and 89/720 to be elapsed.

True motion of the moon on the day is 841' and of the sun 61'; their difference is 780' and their sum 902'. Thus the commencement of the current *tithi* was $(631 \times 60) / (20 \times 780)$ *ghaṭikās* earlier, and the end of the current *tithi* will be $(89 \times 60) / (720 \times 780)$ *ghaṭikās* later, there being 60 *ghaṭikās* in a day.

Again, sum of the longitudes of the sun and the moon is 5^s 7° 33' or 9, 453'. Dividing by 800', we get 11 *yogas* elapsed, and, of the current *yoga*, 653/800 parts elapsed and 147/800 parts to be elapsed. Now, 902' being the sum of the motions of the sun and the moon in a day of 60 *ghaṭikās*, the commencement of the current *yoga* was $(653 \times 60) / (800 \times 902)$ *ghaṭikās* earlier, and the end of the current *yoga* will be $(147 \times 60) / (800 \times 902)$ *ghaṭikās* later.

Here ends Prakīrṇādhikāra.

Section IV—TRIPRAŚNĀDHIKĀRA

(Dealing with the Three Problems relating to Diurnal Motion)

This Section is styled the "section of three inquiries (*praśnas*)". This means that it is intended by the teacher as a reply to his pupil's inquiries respecting the three subjects of direction (*diś*), place (*deśa*), and time (*kāla*).*

The celestial bodies are scattered round the heavens. It looks as if they lie on a sphere with the observer as centre, but it is really not so. The distances of the various heavenly bodies from the observer are not the same. The apparent distances between two heavenly bodies is measured by the angle they subtend at the eye of the observer, which may very well be measured by the arcs on a sphere constructed with the observer in the centre and with any assumed radius. This sphere is called the celestial sphere (*Khagola*).

It is observed that the heavenly bodies and thus the celestial sphere on which they are depicted have an apparent rotation from east to west. This is really due to the diurnal rotation of the Earth on its axis from west to east during the approximate period of 23 hours 56 minutes and 4 seconds of mean time, which period is usually called the sidereal day (*nākṣatra* day).

The sun is observed to have a small motion of 59' 8" amongst the stars from west to east completing a sidereal revolution of 360° in approximately 365¼ days. This path of the sun amongst the stars is a great circle and is called the Ecliptic (*apamaṇḍala* or *krāntimaṇḍala*). The mean interval between two consecutive transits of the sun or between two consecutive sunrises is called a natural or civil day (*sāvana* day in Indian astronomy), and a civil day is therefore slightly greater than the sidereal day (by 3 min. 56 sec. mean time); a civil day is divided into 24 hours mean time.

In the diurnal rotation of the Earth every point of the terrestrial sphere rotates excepting the end points of the axis of rotation, and the two points of the heavens or the celestial sphere obtained by the intersection of the axis of rotation will be observed to be steady and having no apparent motion. These two points of the heavens or the celestial sphere are called Poles (*dhruva-tārās*)—the North Pole and the South Pole. The great circle midway between the Poles is called the Equator (*Viṣuvanmaṇḍala*). The interceptions of the Equator and

*Burgess, *Sūr. Sid.*, II, 69, Note.

the Ecliptic are called the First Point of Aries and the First Point of Libra. The Ecliptic goes to the north of the Equator from the First Point of Aries, and to the south of the Equator from the First Point of Libra.

On account of the diurnal motion of the Earth, every heavenly body apparently rotates round the Poles in circles parallel to the Equator. These circles are called the daily circles (*svāhoratra-maṇḍala*) of the heavenly bodies.

If a tangent plane be drawn to the Earth at the station of the Observer, it cuts the celestial sphere and the heavens into two parts ; the part above the plane is visible to the Observer, while the part below is invisible owing to the opaqueness of the Earth. This plane is called the Horizon (*kṣitiṇi*). A heavenly body is said to rise where its daily circle cuts the Horizon in the east, and is said to set where its daily circle cuts the Horizon in the west.

The point of the heavens or the celestial sphere above the head of the Observer is called the Zenith (*Kha-madhya*) and the point diametrically opposite is called the Nadir. The Zenith and the Nadir are the two Poles of the Horizon.

A great circle of the celestial sphere perpendicular to the Horizon, which passes through the following points fixed for the Observer's station, namely, the North Pole and the South Pole, the Zenith and the Nadir, the North Point and the South Point, and the points of intersection with the celestial Equator, is called the Meridian (*madhyarekhā*). The altitude of the North Pole (in the northern hemisphere) over the Horizon is equal to the terrestrial latitude of the Observer's station.

A great circle perpendicular to the Horizon and the Meridian cutting the Horizon in the East and West Points is called the Prime Vertical (*Samamaṇḍala*). The Equator also cuts the horizon in the east and west points. The great circle passing through the North Pole and the South Pole and the East and West Points is called the *Unmaṇḍala* or Six-O'Clock Circle, because the sun in his daily circle reaches this great circle at 6-o'clock mean time.

When the Observer's station is on the terrestrial equator, his latitude and therefore the altitude of the Pole is Zero ; the Poles are therefore on the Horizon, and the Celestial Equator and the daily circles of the heavenly bodies are perpendicular to the Horizon, and every daily circle is bisected by the Horizon, and therefore every heavenly body is above the Horizon or visible for half the mean civil day and is below the Horizon or invisible during the remaining half of the mean civil day.

